

1990
NCAA

CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

84th Annual Convention ■ January 7-10, 1990 ■ Dallas, Texas

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1990
NCAA
CONVENTION
PROCEEDINGS

84th Annual Convention ■ January 7-10, 1990 ■ Dallas, Texas

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Table of Contents



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422
913/339-1906
December 1990

Edited By: Wallace I. Renfro, *Assistant Executive Director for Publishing.*

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

I. Register 1990	
Administrative Organization	7
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	24
II. Proceedings at the 84th NCAA Convention	
Opening Business Session	53
Opening Remarks	53
Convention Committees	55
Report of Council	55
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	58
Report of Special Committee on Cost Reduction	59
Report of Special Committee to Review the Membership Structure	61
State of the Association	63
Presidential Debate	71
Division I-A Business Session	83
Opening Remarks	83
Proposed Amendments	83
Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football (No. 34)	83
Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football (No. 46)	84
Resolution, Formal Invitations—	
Certified Postseason Football Games (No. 131)	85
Postseason Bowl-Game Eligibility—Written Report (No. 72)	85
Conditioning Programs (No. 90)	86
Division I-AA Business Session	88
Proposed Amendments	88
Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football (No. 44)	88
Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football (No. 45)	91
Full-Time Assistant Coaches—Division I-AA Football (No. 75)	91
Heritage Bowl (No. 91)	91
Division I-AAA Business Session	98
Division II Business Session	100
Review of Proposed Amendments	100
Proposed Amendments	101
Receipt of Nonathletics Financial Assistance—Nonqualifier (No. 29)	101
Review of Proposed Amendments	102
Proposed Amendments	105
Test-Score Report—Division II (No. 40)	105
Review of Proposed Amendments	105
Proposed Amendments	106
Equivalency Exemption—Academic Honor Awards (No. 50)	106
Review of Proposed Amendments	107
Proposed Amendments	107
Seasons of Competition—Division II Track and Cross Country (No. 59)	107
Review of Proposed Amendments	107
Proposed Amendments	108
One-Time Transfer Exception—Division II (No. 65)	108
Review of Proposed Amendments	113
Proposed Amendments	113

Transfer Eligibility—Division II (No. 67)	113
Report of Special Committee on Cost Reduction	113
Proposed Amendments	117
Reconsideration of Transfer Eligibility—Division II (No. 67)	117
Reconsideration of One-Time Transfer Exception—Division II (No. 65)	118
Review of Proposed Amendments	118
Proposed Amendments	120
Orientation Period—Division II Football (No. 92)	120
Review of Proposed Amendments	120
Proposed Amendments	120
Division II Baseball (No. 97)	120
Review of Proposed Amendments	121
Proposed Amendments	122
Printed Recruiting Aids—Division II (No. 113)	122
Review of Proposed Amendments	123
Report of Committees	124
Division II Championships Committee	124
Waivers	126
Nominating Committee	126
Division III Business Session	127
Opening Remarks	127
Reports of Committee	127
Division III Steering Committee	127
Division III Championships Committee	129
Executive Committee	132
Presidents Commission	134
Nominating Committee	136
Division III Forum	136
Length of Seasons	136
Proposed Amendments	150
Admissions and Graduation-Rate Disclosures—Division III (No. 25)	150
Nonathletics Achievement Award—Division III (No. 51)	150
Division III Baseball (No. 98)	153
Out-of-Season Practice Limitations (No. 103)	156
High-School Contests—Division III (No. 121)	159
Tryouts—Division III Recreational Activities (No. 123)	159
Division III Forum	161
Academics Requirements	161
Continuation of Division III Business Session	170
Waivers	170
Division III Forum	170
Graduation Disclosures	170
Hosting NCAA Championships	174
Open Forum	183
Executive Director Comments	185
Closing Remarks	189
Division I Business Session	192
Opening Remarks	192
Proposed Amendments	192
Partial Qualifier—Division I (No. 26)	192
Partial Qualifier—Division I (No. 27)	198
Continuation of Division I Business Session	205
Proposed Amendments	206
Pell Grants (No. 37)	206

Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier—Eligibility (No. 38) ..	208
Resolution, Freshman Eligibility—Division I Men's Basketball (No. 56) ..	210
Two-Year College Transfer—Nonqualifier (No. 57) ..	211
Seasons of Competition—20-Year-Age Rule (No. 58) ..	211
Automatic Qualification for 1991 and 1992 Division I	
Men's Basketball Championship (No. 69-B) ..	212
Sports Sponsorship Criteria (No. 73) ..	213
Reconsideration of Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier—Eligibility (No. 38) ..	214
Division I Softball (No. 99) ..	223
Football Recruiting Contacts—Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 106) ..	223
Contact and Evaluation Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football ..	224
Women's Basketball Evaluations (No. 109) ..	224
Evaluation Periods—Division I Women's Basketball (No. 110) ..	225
Recruiting Contacts—Post-High School (No. 114) ..	225
Campus Athletics Events—Special Seating (No. 118) ..	225
Reconsideration of Two-Year College Transfer—Nonqualifier (No. 56) ..	226
Sports Camps and Clinics—Definition (No. 128) ..	226
Sports Camps and Clinics (No. 130) ..	227
Sports Camps and Clinics—Coaching Staff Employment (No. 126) ..	228
Sports Camps and Clinics—Admissions and Employment (No. 127) ..	228
Sports Camps and Clinics—Permissible Time Period (No. 129) ..	229
Official Visits—ACT or SAT Scores (No. 119) ..	230
Contact and Evaluation Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football ..	231
Waivers ..	231
Special Report ..	231
Nominating Committee ..	234
NCAA Honors Dinner ..	235
General Business Session ..	255
Proposed Amendments ..	255
Consent Package ..	255
Sports Sponsorship Waiver (No. 1) ..	255
Enforcement—Prospective Student-Athlete (No. 7) ..	256
Core-Curriculum Requirements—Deadline (No. 12) ..	257
Reconsideration of Division Voting Action ..	258
Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football (No. 45) ..	258
Reconsideration in Division I-A of Contact and Evaluation	
Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 107) ..	260
Reconsideration of Division II Baseball (No. 97) ..	261
Reconsideration in Division I-AA of Contact and Evaluation	
Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 107) ..	261
Reconsideration in Division I-AA of Football Recruiting	
Contacts—Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 106) ..	262
Proposed Amendments ..	263
Admissions and Graduation-Rate Disclosures—	
Divisions I and II (No. 24) ..	263
Spring Practice—Division II Football (No. 31) ..	268
Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 30) ..	269
Continuation of General Business Session ..	280
Reconsideration of Spring Practice—Division II Football (No. 31) ..	295
Reconsideration of Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 30) ..	297
Continuation of General Business Session ..	297
Financial Aid—Summer School (No. 23) ..	297
Financial Aid—Summer School (No. 32) ..	298
Satisfactory-Progress Exceptions (No. 39) ..	300

Financial Aid — Course Supplies (No. 41)	300
Summer School Financial Aid (No. 42)	301
Financial Aid — Summer School (No. 43)	302
Employment Earnings — Exhausted Eligibility (No. 47)	303
Financial Aid — Equivalency Computation (No. 48)	303
Individual Eligibility — Use of Banned Drugs (No. 52)	304
Postseason Eligibility — Use of Banned Drugs (No. 54)	306
Year-Round Drug Testing (No. 53)	306
Graduate-Student Eligibility (No. 60)	309
Junior College Transfer Eligibility —	
Discontinued/Nonprovisional Sport Exception (No. 62)	309
Transfer Eligibility (No. 63)	310
One-Time Transfer Exception — Financial Aid (No. 64)	310
Transfer Eligibility — '4-2-4' College Transfers (No. 66)	312
Legislative Calendar (No. 68)	312
National Collegiate Men's and Women's Fencing Championships (No. 70)	313
Membership — Effective Dates and Division III	
Financial Aid Requirements (No. 74)	314
Sports and Rules Committees — Composition Requirements (No. 77)	314
Division I Men's Basketball Committee (No. 78)	315
Division II Men's Basketball Committee (No. 79)	315
Men's and Women's Fencing Committee (No. 80)	315
Resolution: Junior College Relations Committee (No. 82)	316
Broken-Time Payments (No. 83)	316
Forms of Pay —	
U S. Olympic Committee Insurance Program (No. 84)	317
Actual and Necessary Expenses — Equipment and Apparel (No. 85)	318
Permissible Awards (No. 86)	318
Transportation Between Teams (No. 87)	319
Academic Awards Banquet (No. 88)	320
Women's Volleyball (No. 100)	320
Season-Ending Volleyball Tournament (No. 101)	321
Season-Ending Fencing Tournament (No. 102)	322
Prospective Student-Athlete (No. 104)	323
Official ACT and SAT Scores (No. 105)	323
Printed Recruiting Aids (No. 112)	324
Supplement to Memorial Resolutions Committee Report	325
Committee Reports	325
Proposed Amendments	325
Post-High School Visits (No. 115)	325
Official Visits — Prospects Entertainment Expenses (No. 116)	326
Official Visits — Student Host Entertainment Allowance (No. 117)	326
Official Visits — Transportation (No. 120)	327
Local Sports Clubs (No. 122)	328
Recreational Activities — Swimming (No. 124)	328
Recission of Official Visits — Transportation (No. 120)	329
Interpretation: Financial Aid (No. 132)	330
III. Appendices	
A. Legislative Proposals	A-1
B. Roll-Call Voting	A-120
C. Convention Committees	A-140
D. NCAA Convention Sites	A-142
E. Past and Present NCAA Officers	A-144

Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

ALBERT M. WITTE
Professor of Law
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701
(Term Expires January 1991*)

Secretary-Treasurer

JUDITH M. SWEET
Director of Athletics
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093
(Term Expires January 1991*)

Executive Director

RICHARD D. SCHULTZ
Nail Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201
Address effective March 1990:
6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211

Division I Vice-President: B. J. Skelton, Clemson University (Term Expires January 1991*)

Division II Vice-President: Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University (Term Expires January 1991*)

Division III Vice-President: Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster (Term Expires January 1990*)

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 4.1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Thurston E. Banks Associate Professor of Chemistry Tennessee Technological University Cookeville, Tennessee 38505	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*
Victor A. Bubas Commissioner Sun Belt Conference 1408 North Westshore Boulevard Tampa, Florida 33607	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Susan A. Collins Assistant Director of Athletics George Mason University Fairfax, Virginia 22030	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3110	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*
Joseph N. Crowley President University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89557	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Frederick E. Gruninger Director of Athletics Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Douglas S. Hobbs Professor of Political Science University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Charles Cavagnaro Director of Athletics Memphis State University Memphis, Tennessee 38152	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1990
Clayne R. Jensen Dean, College of Physical Education Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
David B. Keilitz Director of Athletics Central Michigan University Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859	I-A Mid-American Athletic Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Kathleen M. McNally Assistant Director of Athletics La Salle University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
John P. Reardon Jr Director of Athletics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
B. J. Skelton Dean, Admissions and Registration Clemson University Clemson, South Carolina 29634-4019	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
C. J. Slanicka Chair/Professor, Academic Faculty of Labor Education and Research Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
Albert E. Smith President South Carolina State College Orangeburg, South Carolina 29117	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*
Robert R. Snell Professor, Civil Engineering Department Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
Doris R. Soladay Associate Athletics Director Syracuse University Syracuse, New York 13244-5020	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1990
Craig Thompson Commissioner American South Conference One Galleria Boulevard, Suite 2016 Metairie, Louisiana 70001	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1990
Charlotte West Associate Director of Athletics Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois 62901	I-At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*
Charles Whitcomb Professor of Recreation/ Leisure Studies San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192-0060	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Frank Windegger Director of Athletics Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*
Shirley A. Walker Head Women's Basketball Coach Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1991

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
R. Bruce Allison Director of Athletics Colorado School of Mines Golden, Colorado 80401 (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*
Anthony F. Ceddia President Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257 (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
James Fallis Director of Athletics Lake Superior State University Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan 49783 (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Karen L. Miller Director of Athletics California State Polytechnic University Pomona, California 91768 (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Ronald J. Petro Director of Athletics University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Douglas T. Porter Director of Athletics Fort Valley State College Fort Valley, Georgia 31030 (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*
Elwood N. Shields Director of Athletics Bentley College Waltham, Massachusetts 02254 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Sandra T. Shuler Associate Director of Athletics North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27713 (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Marjorie A. Trout Director of Women's Athletics Millersville University of Pennsylvania Millersville, Pennsylvania 17551 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Kent Wyatt President Delta State University Cleveland, Mississippi 38733 (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Robert G. Bottoms President DePauw University Greencastle, Indiana 46135 (Region 3)	Jan. 1991
Rocco J. Carzo Director of Athletics Tufts University Medford, Massachusetts 02155 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution

Arthur Eason
Director of Athletics
William Paterson College
Wayne, New Jersey 07470
(Region 1)

George M. Harmon
President
Millsaps College
Jackson, Mississippi 39210
(Region 3)

David A. Jacobs
Director of Athletics
Whittier College
Whittier California 90608
(Region 4)

William A. Marshall
Director of Athletics
Franklin and Marshall College
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17604-3003
(Region 2)

Patricia A. Rogers
Department Chair, Physical Education
Associate Director of Athletics
State University of New York
Albany, New York 12222
(Region 2)

John M. Schael
Director of Athletics
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
(Region 4)

Jenepher P. Shillingford
Director of Athletics
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010
(Region 2)

Alvin J. Van Wie
Director of Athletics, Chair,
Physical Education Department
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691
(Region 3)

Term Expires

Jan. 1993*

Jan. 1993*

Jan. 1993*

Jan. 1990*

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1991 *

Jan. 1992*

Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. [Constitution 4.2.]

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-AA	Francis W. Bonner Professor of English Furman University Greenville, South Carolina 29613	Jan. 1990*
I-A	Edward E. Bozik Assistant President, Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	Jan. 1990*
I-AA	Marino H. Casem Director of Athletics Southern University Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813-2109	Jan. 1991*
I-A	Eugene F. Corrigan Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference P.O. Drawer ACC Greensboro, North Carolina 27419-6999	Jan. 1993*
I-AAA	Don J. DiJulia Assistant Vice-President and Director of Athletics St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	Jan. 1990
III	Royce N. Flippin Jr Director of Athletics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	Jan. 1991*
II	Rosemary Fri Associate Director of Athletics University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado 80639	Jan. 1991*
I-A	Leanne Grotke Associate Director of Athletics California State University Fullerton, California 92634	Jan. 1990*
I-A	Martha E. Hawthorne Assistant Director of Athletics Rice University Houston, Texas 77005	Jan. 1992*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
II VP	Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093	Jan. 1991*
I VP (I-A)	B. J. Skelton Dean, Admissions and Registration Clemson University Clemson, South Carolina 29634-4019	Jan. 1991*
III VP	Alvin J. Van Wie Director of Athletics, Chair, Physical Education Department College of Wooster Wooster, Ohio 44691	Jan. 1990*

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	<i>Term as Chair Expires</i>
Commission Chair: Martin A. Massengale University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Jan. 1990*
Division I Chair: Lattie F. Coor University of Vermont	Jan. 1990*
Division II Chair: Thomas A. Bond Eastern New Mexico University	Jan. 1990*
Division III Chair: Rev. William J. Byron Catholic University	Jan. 1990*

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Lattie F. Coor President University of Vermont Burlington, Vermont 05405	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Edward B. Fort Chancellor North Carolina A&T State University Greensboro, North Carolina 27411	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Gail Fullerton President San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192	I-A At-Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Harold H. Haak President California State University Fresno, California 93740	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*
Sheldon Hackney President University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Rev. Albert J. DiUlio President Xavier University Cincinnati, Ohio 45207	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Thomas K. Hearn President Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1990
Edward H. Jennings President Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Joseph B. Johnson President Grambling State University Grambling, Louisiana 71245	I-AA At-Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*
Martin A. Massengale Chancellor University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68588	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien Chancellor University of New Orleans New Orleans, Louisiana 70148	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1990
Paul J. Olscamp President Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, Ohio 43403	I-A Mid-American Athletic Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
Lt. Gen. Dave R. Palmer Superintendent U.S. Military Academy West Point, New York 10996	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
Chase N. Peterson President University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*
Stanley G. Rives President Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois 61920	I-AA Central (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*
Bernard F. Sliger President Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Stephen Joel Trachtenberg President George Washington University Washington, D.C. 20052	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
William E. Tucker Chancellor Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
R. Gerald Turner Chancellor University of Mississippi University, Mississippi 38677	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
Dwight D. Vines President Northeast Louisiana University Monroe, Louisiana 71209	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Michael R. Ferrari President Drake University Des Moines, Iowa 50311	I-AAA At-Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1991
Charles E. Young Chancellor University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990

Division II

Name, Institution	Term Expires
Michael J. Adanti President Southern Connecticut State University New Haven, Connecticut 06515 (Region 1)	Jan. 1991*
James B. Appleberry President Northern Michigan University Marquette, Michigan 49859 (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
Billy C. Black President Albany State College Albany, Georgia 31705 (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Thomas A. Bond President Eastern New Mexico University Portales, New Mexico 88130 (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
Robert Dickeson President University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado 80639 (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*
Asa N. Green President Livingston University Livingston, Alabama 35470 (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
Rodney C. Kelchner President Mansfield University of Pennsylvania Mansfield, Pennsylvania 16933 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990
Walter R. Peterson President Franklin Pierce College Rindge, New Hampshire 03461 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Margaret R. Preska President Mankato State University Mankato, Minnesota 56001 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Tyronza R. Richmond Chancellor North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*
Lloyd D. Vincent President Angelo State University San Angelo, Texas 76909 (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Division III	
<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
John R. Brazil President Southeastern Massachusetts University North Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747 (Region 1)	Jan. 1991*
Rev. William J. Byron President Catholic University Washington, D.C. 20064 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Nenah E. Fry President Sweet Briar College Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595 (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314 (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*
Roger H. Martin President Moravian College Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18018 (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
William A. McMillan President Rust College Holly Springs, Mississippi 38635 (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution

Term Expires

Jack L. Stark
President
Claremont McKenna College
(Claremont McKenna-Harvey
Mudd-Scripps Colleges)
Claremont, California 91711
(Region 4)

Catherine Tisinger
President
North Adams State College
North Adams, Massachusetts 01247
(Region 1)

David L. Warren
President
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43015
(Region 3)

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1993*

Jan. 1993*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA National Office

Richard D. Schultz, *Executive Director*

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Associate Executive Director*

Stephen R. Morgan, *Associate Executive Director*

Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*

Ted C. Tow, *Associate Executive Director*

John E. Lamb, *Director of Aviation*

Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Conventions and Meetings/
Assistant to the Executive Director*

Administration

Merrily Dean Baker, *Assistant Executive Director for Administration*

Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*

Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*

Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*

Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*

Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*

Oswaldo Garcia, *Youth Programs Coordinator*

Colleen Lím, *Youth Programs Coordinator*

Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*

Patricia A. Schaefer, *Administrative Assistant for Sports Sciences*

Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*

Shirley Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*

Business

Frank E. Marshall, *Assistant Executive Director for Business Affairs*

Richard D. Hunter, *Director of Operations*

Keith E. Martin, *Director of Accounting*

Daniel W. Spencer, *Director of Data Processing*

Douglas A. Carpenter, *Programmer/Analyst*

Kelly G. Conway, *Programmer/Analyst*

Kathy L. Day, *Programmer/Analyst*

William C. Foreman, *Building Manager*

Alex B. Freeburne, *Programmer/Analyst*

Robin A. Garcia, *Accountant*

Marla B. Gleason, *Office Services Center Manager*

Suzanne E. Mason, *Personnel Manager*

Sarah A. Thomas, *Accountant*

Championships

Patricia E. Bork, *Assistant Executive Director for Championships*

Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*

Karl D. Benson, *Director of Championships*

William Hancock, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*

Betsy G. Stephenson, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Operations*

Lacy Lee Baker, *Associate Director of Championships*

Philip A. Buttafuoco, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Gail D. Hunter, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Nancy J. Latimore, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Harley W. Lewis, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Donna J. Noonan, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Joseph A. Quinlan Jr., *Assistant Director of Division I
Men's Basketball Championship*
Marie T. Tuite, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Communications

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director for Communications*
James A. Marchiony, *Director of Communications*
John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*
Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotion*
Kerwin E. Hudson, *Assistant Director of Communications*
Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Director of Communications*
Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Promotion*
James F. Wright, *Assistant Director of Communications*
James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*
Richard M. Campbell, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
Gary K. Johnson, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
John D. Painter, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
Sean W. Straziscar, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*
119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019

Compliance Services

John H. Leavens, *Assistant Executive Director for Compliance Services*
David A. Knopp, *Director of Compliance Services*
Kevin C. Lennon, *Director of Compliance Services*
Maureen E. Devlin, *Compliance Representative*
Curt L. Hamakawa, *Compliance Representative*
John P. Hardt, *Compliance Representative*
Gary F. Karner, *Compliance Representative*
Charles A. Jones, *Compliance Representative*
Michael S. McNeely, *Compliance Representative*
Brenda R. Weare, *Compliance Representative*

Enforcement

S. David Berst, *Assistant Executive Director for Enforcement*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*
Janet M. Justus, *Director of Eligibility*
Robert J. Minnix, *Director of Enforcement*
Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*
Daniel A. Calandro, *Enforcement Representative*
David A. Didion, *Enforcement Representative*

Carrie A. Doyle, *Enforcement Representative*
Susan E. Glatter, *Eligibility Representative*
Richard A. Johanningmeier, *Enforcement Representative*
Adrienne R. Lotson, *Enforcement Representative*
Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
Arthur J. McAfee III, *Enforcement Representative*
Steven D. Nelson, *Enforcement Representative*
Steven C. Rueckert, *Enforcement Representative*
William S. Saum, *Enforcement Representative*
Stephanie A. Sivak, *Enforcement Representative*
Robert L. Stroup III, *Enforcement Representative*
Dirk L. Taitt, *Enforcement Representative*
Janet S. Thomson, *Eligibility Representative*

Legislative Services

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director for Legislative Services*
Richard J. Evrard, *Director of Legislative Services*
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Director of Legislative Services*
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Legislative Assistant*
Shane Lyons, *Legislative Assistant*
Stephen A. Mallonee, *Legislative Assistant*
Louis A. Onofrio, *Legislative Assistant*
Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*
Carol A. Powell, *Legislative Assistant*

Publishing

Wallace I. Renfro, *Assistant Executive Director for Publishing*
Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*
Victor M. Royal, *Director of Graphics*
Thomas A. Wilson, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
Timothy J. Lilley, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*
Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*
Jack L. Copeland, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
Marlynn R. Jones, *Advertising Manager, The NCAA News*
Cheryl A. McElroy, *Publications Editor*
Michelle A. Pond, *Publications Editor*
J. Gregory Summers, *Publications Editor*

Visitors Center/Special Projects

Robert E. Sprenger, *Assistant Executive Director*
Will J. Rudd, *Curator/Researcher*

84th Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: A. Don Drennan, David B. Merrell
 Adelphi University: Robert E. Hartwell
 Akron, University of: James Dennison, Robert Fournier, David Jamison, Dawn Moore, William V. Muse, Marion A. Ruebel
 Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: John D. Jones, Charles A. McCallum, J. Dudley Pewitt, Calli Theisen
 Alabama, University of, Huntsville: Paul H. Brand
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Thomas L. Jones, Gary White
 Alabama A&M University: Betty Kelly Austin, Hoyt Taylor
 Alabama State University: Leon Howard
 Alaska, University of, Anchorage: Donald F. Behrend, Jack Peterson, Ronald J. Petro
 Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Ed S. Cridge, G. Lynn Lashbrook, Karen J. Morris, Harris Shelton
 Albany, State University of New York: William M. Moore, Patricia A. Rogers
 Albany State College (Georgia): Billy C. Black, Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Alcorn State University: James A. Brooks, Norris A. Edney, Shirley A. Walker, Walter Washington
 Alfred University: Eugene Castrovillo, Edward G. Coll Jr.
 Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom
 American International College: Robert E. Burke
 American University: Dick Myers, Joseph F. O'Donnell
 American University of Puerto Rico: Rene Derieux
 Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding
 Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, O. S. Cauthen, Jerry Vandergriff, Lloyd D. Vincent
 Anna Maria College: Stephen C. Washkevich
 Appalachian State University: Judy Clarke, Jim Garner, Alan J. Hauser, John E. Thomas
 Arizona, University of: Robert Bockrath, Cedric W. Dempsey, Thomas J. Ford, Kathleen LaRose, Robert W. Sankey
 Arizona State University: Bill Bryant, Lattie F. Coor, Jill DeMichele, Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Jerry Kingston
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Daniel E.

Ferritor, Ken Hatfield, Beverly D. Rouse, Albert M. Witte
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Kevin Anglin, Gary A. Heidt
 Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, Larry Lacewell, Eugene W. Smith
 Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer
 Asbury College: Rita J. Pritchett
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling
 Assumption College: Rita Castagna
 Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, William Davidson, James E. Martin, Kermit Perry, Hindman Wall
 Augusta College: Mary Lisko
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell
 Augustana College (South Dakota): A. Richard Petersen
 Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian
 Austin Peay State University: Gaines Hunt, Tim L. Weiser
 Averett College: Vesa K. Hiltunen
 Babson College: J. Steven Stirling
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
 Ball State University: Don Purvis, John E. Reno, Andrea Seger, John E. Worthen
 Baptist College: Howard Bagwell, Stephen D. Hudson, Chuck Welty
 Barry University: Eddie A. Coletti
 Bates College: Suzanne R. Coffey, Robert W. Hatch
 Baylor University: Skip Cox, David Guinn, Bill Menefee, James S. Netherton
 Bellarmine College: David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding
 Bentley College: Kathleen Fitzgibbons, Elwood N. Shields
 Berea College: Joy Hager
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
 Bethany College (West Virginia): James A. Zalacca
 Bethel College (Minnesota): Dave Klostreich
 Bethune-Cookman College: Lloyd C. Johnson
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Stephen Erber, Jessie A. Godfrey, Joel Thirer
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Brian Johnson, Burton Reese
 Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Carol Ladwig
 Boston College: Rev. Robert Braunreuther, Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn, John McCutcheon
 Boston University: Larry Fudge, Averill C. Haines, Gary Strickler
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Bowie State University: Zola E. Boone, Joseph A. Wilder
 Bowling Green State University: Mary Ellen Cloninger, John C. Gregory, Ken Kavanagh, Marvin L. Kumler, Paul J. Olscamp
 Bradley University: Martin G. Abegg, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
 Brandeis University: Thomas E. Foley, Jeffrey W. Cohen
 Bridgeport, University of: Francis W. Poisson

Bridgewater College (Virginia): Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M. Kinder
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): Cecelia DeMarco
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace
 Brockport State University College: William Stier Jr.
 Brooklyn College: Arnold Markoe, Len Roitman
 Brown University: John C. Parry, Joan W. Taylor
 Bryant College: Arthur H. Boulet, Leon A. Drury, Leslie L. LaFond
 Bryn Mawr College: Jenepher P. Shillingford, Julie Zuraw
 Bucknell University: Rosalyn K. Ewan, Thomas C. Greaves, Rick Hartzell, Robert A. Latour
 Buena Vista College: Ben Donath
 Buffalo State College: Fred J. Hartrick, Thomas J. Quatroche
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Norman Baker, Edwin D. Muto, Nelson E. Townsend
 Butler University: Don Benbow, Richard E. Martin, Mary Ann Rohleder

 California, University of, Berkeley: Jack Citrin, Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Samuel H. Logan, James L. Sochor
 California, University of, Irvine: John E. Caine, James H. Fallon, Kaia Hedlund, Horace Mitchell, Jack W. Peltason, Henry Pontell, Otto W. Reyer
 California, University of, Los Angeles: David W. Currey, Peter T. Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Jim Milhorn, John Sandbrook, Michael Sondheimer, Charles E. Young
 California, University of, Riverside: James H. Erickson, Richard H. Perry, James J. Sims
 California, University of, San Diego: Earl W. Edwards, Michael Hipp, Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Michael T. Bowers, Alice Henry, John Kasser
 California, University of, Santa Cruz: Jim Gasso
 California Institute of Technology: Daniel Bridges
 California Lutheran University: Robert Doering, Jerry H. Miller
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Marilyn McNeil, Kendrick W. Walker, Michael Wenzl
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Forrest Barnes III, Keith B. Ehrenreich, Karen L. Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard
 California State University, Chico: Don Batie
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Harold Charnofsky, Daniel G. Guerrero
 California State University, Fresno: Gary A. Cunningham, John Easterbrook, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis

California State University, Fullerton: Edward O. Carroll, Leanne Grotke, Barbara S. Stone
 California State University, Hayward: Judith Hirsch, Alfred R. Mathews Jr.
 California State University, Long Beach: Karl Anatol, Kay Don, Corey Johnson, Curtis L. McCray, Keith I. Polakoff
 California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, David Thomas, Fleur Yano
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Don Brownlee, James W. Cleary, Robert J. Hiegert, E. T. Peckham
 California State University, Sacramento: Robert O. Bess, Lee McElroy, Robert T. Olmstead Jr., Irene Shea
 California State University, San Bernardino: Joe Bas, David L. Suenram
 California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue, Wayne S. Pierce
 California University of Pennsylvania: Paul E. Burd, Janice L. McConnell, Elmo Natali
 Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, Ralph Honderd, Doris Zuidema
 Cameron University: Don Davis, Jerry Hrnciar, Robert L. Ziegler
 Campbell University: Wendell L. Carr
 Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz
 Carleton College: Mylla Urban
 Carnegie-Mellon University: William F. Elliott, John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser
 Carroll College: Merle Masonholder
 Carthage College: Kevin F. McCarthy
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Patricia B. Kilpatrick, Glenn Nicholls
 Castleton State College: James R. Thieser
 Catholic University: Rev. William J. Byron, Jone Dowd, Fred O'Connor, Amy Patton
 Centenary College: Walter C. Stevens
 Central College (Iowa): Marjorie Giles
 Central Connecticut State University: Ross J. Baiera, Judith A. Davidson, Henry S. Enck, Frank R. A. Resnick, Andrea S. Wickerham
 Central Florida, University of: Steven Altman, William G. Callarman, Art W. Zeleznik
 Central Michigan University: David B. Keilitz, Douglas W. Nance, Sue Nissen, John Weisenburger, Marcy Weston
 Central Missouri State University: Philip W. Conn, Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes, Susan M. Jacobson
 Central State University (Oklahoma): Bill J. Lillard, Paul E. Roach, John E. Wagnon
 Centre College: Charles Vahlkamp
 Chaminade University: T. Michael Hogan Jr., Kent Keith, Melba Kop, Mike Vasconcellos

Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Henry L. Hardy, Andrew Hinson
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Mary Jean Mulvaney, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus
 Chicago State University: Albert Avant
 Christopher Newport College: Timothy E. Morgan
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Joseph A. Steger, Charles F. Taylor, George Wolterman
 Citadel, The: Walt Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey, Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Jack L. Stark, John Zinda
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Frank Lignelli, Hal R. Wassink
 Clark Atlanta University: Raymond Williams
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda Moulton, Richard P. Traina
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Clemson University: Michael G. Carmichael, R. Allison Dalton, Len Gough, Max Lennon, Nick Lomak, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson Jr., B. J. Skelton
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey, Jan P. Muczyk, Ronald G. Schultz
 Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina: Ronald G. Eaglin, Edgar L. Green, Andy E. Hendrick
 Colby College: Gene B. DeLorenzo
 Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston, Janet A. Little
 Colorado, University of: James Corbridge, Bill Marolt, Richard Tharp
 Colorado College: Susan Ashley, Susan Bethanis, Richard L. Taber
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: Chuck Bell, G. James Francis, L. Oval Jaynes, Brian Snow, Christine Susemihl
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Alvin R. Paul, Marjorie N. Tversky
 Columbus College: Robert D. Peterson
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pipho
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, John T. Casteen III, Elizabeth McDaniel, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Todd Turner
 Connecticut College: Charles B. Luce, Wayne R. Swanson
 Coppin State College: Ronald K. DeSouza
 Cornell College: David Marker, Ellen Whale
 Cornell University: Brian Austin, Betsy East, Laing E. Kennedy
 Cortland State University College: G. David Pollick, Lee Roberts
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Don Leahy

 Dartmouth College: Carolyn Campbell, Richard G. Jaeger, Louise O'Neal
 Davidson College: Sterling T. Martin Jr., J. B. Stroud

Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Thomas J. Frericks, Dennis Gerdeman
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson, Richard A. Wilson
 Delaware State College: William B. DeLauder, John C. Martin, Gladys D. W. Motley, Ulysses S. Washington Jr.
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Ray Cleere, Jody Correro, Jim Jordan, Mike Robbins, Kent Wyatt
 Denison University: Theodore H. Barclay, Robin Bartlett, F. Trevor Gamble, Cathy Benton
 Denver, University of: Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle, Jean Lenti Ponsetto
 DePauw University: Robert G. Bottoms, Ted Katula
 Detroit, University of: Patricia Kellstrom, Brad Kinsman
 Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Ken Howard, James E. McIver Jr., Clarence M. Stewart
 Dowling College: Richard Jamison
 Drake University: Curtis W. Blake, Michael R. Ferrari, Robert MacKenzie, Lou Ann Simpson
 Drew University: Richard E. Szlasa
 Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary F. Semanik
 Duke University: Tom Butters, E. J. McDonald, Thomas A. Spragens Jr., John C. Weistart
 Duquesne University: Brian Colleary

 Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
 East Carolina University: Richard R. Eakin, Dave Hart Jr., Ernest W. Schwarz
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Richard L. DeSchraver, Carey J. Snyder
 East Tennessee State University: Charles E. Clark, Janice C. Shelton
 East Texas State University: Richard Fulkerson, Margaret Harbison, Ernest Hawkins, Jerry D. Morris
 Eastern Connecticut State University: Sharlene Peter
 Eastern Illinois University: Ron Paap, Stanley G. Rives, Michael R. Ryan, Robert E. Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs, H. Hanly Funderburk Jr., Martha Mullins
 Eastern Mennonite College: John H. Denlinger
 Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Lucy Parker, William E. Shelton, Eugene D. Smith
 Eastern Montana College: Randy Howard
 Eastern New Mexico University: B. B. Lees, Wilbur D. Smartnick
 Eastern Washington University: Darlene Bailey, B. Dell Felder, John Johnson, Frank E. Nelson, Ron Raver
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Kathleen Lipkovich, James K.

McDonald
 Elizabeth City State University: W. Curtis Williams Elizabethtown
 College: D. Kenneth Ober
 Elmhurst College: Allen F. Ackerman
 Emory University: David A. Ford, Gerald B. Lowrey, Sandy Tillman
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Linda Crick, J. Robert
 Knott, James S. Vinson

Fairfield University: Harold Menninger, William P. Schimpf
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Hallie Cohen, William T.
 Klika
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Roy Danforth, Ann Gulino,
 Richard Panicucci
 Fayetteville State University: Joseph Monroe
 Ferris State University: Thomas G. Cook, Dean Davenport, Mark
 Kosciuszko, Helen Popovich
 Ferrum College: Coulbourn H. Tyler
 Fisk University: Harriet A. Hamilton, George Neely
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Florida, University of: William Arnsparger, Robert A. Bryan, Nicholas
 Cassisi, Jeremy Foley, Mandell Glicksburg, Ann Marie Lawler
 Florida A&M University: Frederick S. Humphries, Walter Reed
 Florida Atlantic University: Jack G. Mehl, Lois Cole Williams
 Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens
 Florida International University: Arthur W. Herriott, Mary Alice
 Manella, Richard A. Young
 Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Karen Frair, Bob
 Goin, Bernard F. Sliger, Janice M. Stocker
 Fordham University: Joseph J. McGowan Jr., Francis X. McLaughlin,
 Rev. Joseph A. O'Hare
 Fort Hays State University: Edward H. Hammond, Thomas E.
 Spicer
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Franklin and Marshall College: Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
 Franklin Pierce College: Richard L. Burns, John J. Cunningham,
 Bruce Kirsch, Walter R. Peterson
 Fredonia State University College: Everett J. Phillips, Thomas E.
 Prevet
 Frostburg State College: Loyal K. Park
 Furman University: John M. Block, Francis W. Bonner, Ray Parlier

Gannon University: Howard Elwell, Charles M. Murphy
 Geneseo State University College: Ronald P. Satryb, John L. Spring
 George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley,
 Jack E. Kvanz
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress,
 Robert A. Chernak, Jack Friedenthal, Susie Jones, Ben Trachten-

berg, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, Mary Jo Warner
 Georgetown University: Wayne Knoll, Joseph C. Lang, Francis X.
 Rienzo
 Georgia, University of: David Coker, Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R.
 Hayley, Charles B. Knapp, Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Bernadette V. McGlade, James E.
 Murphy III, William M. Sangster
 Georgia Southern College: Richard C. Armstrong, William H. Bolen,
 John Ratliff, David B. Wagner
 Georgia State University: G. Rankin Cooter, William S. Patrick
 Gettysburg College: Lois Bowers, Charles W. Winters
 Glassboro State College: Joy L. Heritage, E. Theodore Kershner
 Gonzaga University: John Preston
 Goucher College: William J. Kaiser
 Grambling State University: Fred C. Hobdy, Joseph B. Johnson,
 Eddie Milton Jones
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Michael J. Kovalchik
 Greensboro College: Milton E. Reece, Kim A. Strable
 Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist

Hamilton College: Thomas E. Murphy
 Hamline University: Linda C. Delano
 Hampden-Sydney College: Louis F. Miller
 Hampton University: Henry Ford, Walter L. Lovett, Dennis Thomas
 Hardin-Simmons University: Jesse C. Fletcher, Ed S. Hughes
 Hartford, University of: C. Donald Cook
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Harvard University: Patricia H. Miller, John P. Reardon Jr.
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein
 Hawaii, University of: Rockne Freitas, Marilyn Moniz-Kahoohano-
 hano, Stanley B. Sheriff
 Hillsdale College: Jack H. McAvoy
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Michael J. Hanna, Ellen J.
 Staurowsky
 Hofstra University: J. Richard Block, James V. Garvey, Cindy
 Lewis, James M. Shuart
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Holy Cross College: Rev. John E. Brooks, Ronald S. Perry
 Hope College: Anne E. Irwin
 Houston, University of: James R. Benbrook, Conrad Colbert, Rudy
 Davalos
 Houston Baptist University: T. John Alexander
 Howard University: William P. Moultrie, Sondra Norrell-Thomas
 Humboldt State University: Chuck Lindemann, John Yarnall
 Hunter College: Terry Wansart

Idaho, University of: Kathy D. Clark, W. Harold Godwin, Gary
 Hunter

Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Kelley Wiltbank
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: David L. Chicoine, Mildred Barnes Griggs, Karol A. Kahrs, John Mackovic, Robert Todd
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Thomas Russo
 Illinois Benedictine College: Anthony L. La Scala
 Illinois College: William A. Anderson
 Illinois State University: Linda Herman, Albert Otto, Donna Taylor, Ronald D. Wellman, D. Jo Workman
 Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren
 Immaculata College: Marion Wilkinson
 Indiana State University: C. Sue Davis, Brian D. Faison, John C. Jessell, Richard G. Landini, Andrea Myers
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Mark Deady, Isabella Hutchison, Elizabeth Kurpius, Marianne H. Mitchell, Haydn H. Murray
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, David A. DeCoster, Vivian L. Fuller, Herman L. Sledzik
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Donald J. Schmidt
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright
 Iona College: Michael T. Christy, Joe Foulke, Rich Petriccione
 Iowa, University of: Samuel L. Becker, Larry Bruner, Chalmers W. Elliott, Christine H. B. Grant, W. Fred Mims, Bonnie Slatton
 Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, J. Elaine Heiber, Charles E. McCandless, Max Urick, Jim Walden
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Kristen M. Ford, Bonnie J. Gordon, Matthew B. Wall, James J. Whalen

Jackson State University: Howard Davis, Mel Evans, James A. Hefner
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Hope P. Davis, Harold J. McGee
 Jacksonville University: James J. Brady, Donald O. Jacobs, Bill Robertson
 James Madison University: S. Dean Ehlers, Janet D. Lucas, William R. Nelson, Robert L. Scott
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
 John Carroll University: James M. Lavin
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin
 Johns Hopkins University: Robert H. Scott
 Johnson C. Smith University: Phyllis Worthy Dawkins
 Juniata College: William F. Berrier

Kalamazoo College: Marilyn A. Maurer
 Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Robert E. Frederick, Richard Konzem
 Kansas State University: Robert S. Krause, Steve Miller, Chris Peterson, Jeff Schemmel, Robert R. Snell, Jon Wefald
 Kean College: Patricia Hannisch, Glenn Hedden
 Kearney State College: Dick Beechner

Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
 Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Thomas J. Barber, Judy Devine, John Konstantinos, John Robert Quatroche
 Kentucky, University of: John B. Bostick, Kathleen J. DeBoer, Larry W. Ivy, Robert G. Lawson, Charles Wethington
 Kentucky State University: Donald W. Lyons, Mary L. Smith
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum, Paul W. Hartman
 Kenyon College: Sandra L. Moore
 King's College: John J. Dorish, Rev. James Lackenmier
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Linda S. Crawshaw, Irv Hess, David McFarland

La Salle University: Joseph Kovatch, Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen
 Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, David W. Ellis, Herman C. Kissiah, Olav B. Kollevoll
 Lake Superior State University: Cindy Erickson, James Fallis, Charles W. Jones, Harry Pike
 Lamar University: Bill J. Franklin, Gary Gallup, Sonny Jolly, Larry W. Spradley
 Lawrence University: Rich Agness
 Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino
 Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Harvey G. Stenger Jr., Joseph D. Sterrett
 Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr.
 Lenoir-Rhyne College: Rufus L. Moretz, Keith M. Ochs
 Lewis University: Dennis F. Rio, Paul Ruddy
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, Philip Captain, Bobby Richardson
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Yvonne Hoard, Lucius Jones
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green, James P. Pate, Roy Underwood
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Sharon E. Taylor
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Center: Tom Thompson
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone
 Longwood College: Charles B. Bolding, William F. Dorrill, Louis M. Markwith
 Loras College: Howard Thomas
 Louisiana State University: William E. Davis, Joe Dean, Billy M. Seay
 Louisiana Tech University: Patrick P. Garrett, Paul A. Miller, Daniel D. Reneau
 Louisville, University of: Dennis C. Golden, Dennis J. Golden, Burt L. Monroe Jr., William C. Olsen, Donald C. Swain
 Lowell, University of: R. Wayne Edwards, Linda H. Kistler
 Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, James Smith
 Loyola Marymount University: Brian Quinn
 Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Rame-nofsky, Charles T. Schwarz
 Luther College: David T. Nelson

Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms

Macalester College: Kenneth W. Andrews

Maine, University of: Thomas Boeh, Linwood Carville, Jim Sterk,
Tim M. Van Alstine, Kevin M. White

Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola

Manhattan College: Bro. Francis R. Bowers, Robert J. Byrnes, Kristi
Groteke

Manhattanville College: Thomas Weingartner

Mankato State University: Don Amiot, Georgene Brock, Joe Farn-
ham, Margaret R. Preska

Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Rodney C. Kelchner, Roger N.
Maisner

Marist College: Eugene Doris

Marquette University: William L. Cords, Carla H. Hay, Tat Shiely

Marshall University: Dorothy E. Hicks, William Lee Moon Sr., Dale
F. Nitzschke

Mary Baldwin College: Mary Ann Kasselmann

Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Charles R. Brown,
Susan Kitchen, John Kloetzel, Kathleen Zerrlaut

Maryland, University of, College Park: Gerald Gurney, William E.
Kirwan, Lewis Perkins, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler

Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E.
Gregory, William P. Hytche

Maryville College (Missouri): David R. Pierce

Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David C. Bischoff, Frank P.
McInerney, Elaine Sortino

Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Royce N. Flippin Jr.

McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle, Robert G. Hayes, Robert
Hebert

Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson

Memphis State University: Charles Cavagnaro, Lynn Parkes,
Timothy L. Sumner, Nicholas L. White

Mercer University: Bobby Pope, Dan R. Quisenberry

Mercy College: Neil D. Judge

Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo

Merrimack College: Rev. John E. Deegan, Robert M. DeGregorio Jr.,
Joseph Lee

Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker

Methodist College: Tom Austin

Metropolitan State College: William Helman

Miami, University of (Florida): Paul Dee, Sam Jankovich, L. Douglas
Johnson

Miami University (Ohio): Darrell D. Hedric, Harold W. Jasper, R. C.
Johnson, Paul G. Pearson, Karen Womack

Michigan, University of: Gwendolyn S. Cruzat, Douglas Kahn,
Phyllis M. Ocker, Jack P. Weidenbach

Michigan State University: Michael L. Kasavana, Kathy Lindahl,

Douglas W. Weaver

Michigan Technological University: Ted Kearly, Darrell W. Smith
Middle Tennessee State University: John E. Stanford, Jessie Warren

Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson

Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Russell L. De Souza, Gary
W. Reighard, Marjorie A. Trout

Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman, Harriett L. Crannell

Millsaps College: George M. Harmon, Bob King

Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Greg Fox, Linda M. Larson, Bruce
M. McLeod, Patricia A. Merrier

Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Richard M. Bay, Elayne M.
Donahue, Jo-Ida C. Hansen, Daniel L. Meinert, Jack Merwin,
Donna J. Olson, Robert A. Stein, Chris Voelz

Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Kittye R. Jones, R. Gerald
Turner, Max W. Williams, Leslie Wyatt

Mississippi College: Shelton Hand, John W. Legg, John M. Williams

Mississippi State University: David C. Boles, Walter B. Newsom,
Larry O. Templeton, Donald W. Zacharias

Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman

Mississippi Valley State University: Reginal L. Henderson, Charles
Prophet

Missouri, University of, Columbia: Haskell M. Monroe Jr., Carl
Settergren, Richard P. Tamburo

Missouri, University of, Kansas City: J. Joseph Doerr, Floyd Walker

Missouri, University of, Rolla: Martin C. Jischke, Rodney A. Schaefer

Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Thomas Schnell, Charles G. Smith

Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Wayne A. Harrell

Missouri Western State College: Ed B. Harris

Molloy College: Denise Cohen

Monmouth College (New Jersey): Joseph A. Biedron, Marilyn A.
Larsen, Joan Martin Montana, University of: James V. Koch,
Robert Lindsay, Kathy Noble

Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Edward L. Hanson,
Virginia Hunt

Montclair State College: Gregory L. Lockard, Merry Ormsby

Moravian College: Rocco J. Calvo, Roger H. Martin

Morehead State University: C. Nelson Grote, Steve Hamilton

Morehouse College: Arthur J. McAfee Jr.

Morgan State University: Leonard Braxton, Raymond A. Downs

Morningside College: Don Poppen

Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson Mount Holyoke College:
Michael Hyer, Laurie Priest

Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): James H. Kehoe

Mount Union College: Truman D. Turnquist

Muhlenberg College: Connie R. Kunda

Murray State University: James L. Booth, Margaret Simmons,
Michael D. Strickland

Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey

Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner, Martin A. Massengale, James O'Hanlon, Tom Osborne, Al Papik
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Richard B. Flynn, Robert F. Gibson
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, Christina L. Kunzer, Bradley L. Rothermel
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Anne Hope
 New England College: Janet R. Kittell
 New Hampshire, University of: Gilbert Chapman, John H. Lawson, David O'Connor, Michael O'Neil
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr.
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Paul C. Hausser
 New Mexico, University of: Robert J. Desiderio, L. F. Diehm, Linda K. Estes, R. Gary Ness
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James Fisher, Albert Gonzales, James E. Halligan
 New Orleans, University of: H. Hugh Floyd, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York, City College of: Paul Bobb
 New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr.
 New York Maritime College, State University of: James Migli
 New York University: Jack E. Peckett, Daniel E. Quilty
 Niagara University: Michael Jankowski
 Nicholls State University: Phil Greco
 Nichols College: Karen J. Tropp
 Norfolk State University: Iris G. Brown, William L. Price, P. LaVerne Sweat
 North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
 North Alabama, University of: Bill Jones, Roy S. Stevens
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Edward G. Farrell
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, Paul Hardin, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, Arthur Padilla, John D. Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Doug Orr, Judy Rose, Thomas C. Turner, J. H. Woodward
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: Lynne C. Agee, James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Fred L. Drake, Harold Hall, David B. Knight, William E. Moran, Debbie Yow
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks, Charles L. Cahill, David K. Miller, James C. Sabella
 North Carolina A&T State University: Edward B. Fort, Orby Moss Jr., James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, Christopher T. Fisher, Robert S. Poole, Tyrone R. Richmond, Sandra T. Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Nora Lynn Finch, Harold B. Hopfenberg, Larry K. Monteith, John Shafer

North Carolina Wesleyan College: C. Michael Fox
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson, Richard Wilders
 North Dakota, University of: John Gasparini, Dave Gunther, Kathy McCann, George W. Schubert
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer
 North Texas, University of: J. Gail Curry, Alfred F. Hurley, Corky C. Nelson, Lynda Nygren, Linda Tyler Rollins, Jerry Yeric, George Young
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis, Dwight D. Vines
 Northeast Missouri State University: Walter H. Ryle, Cheryl Tucker
 Northeastern Illinois University: K. Dale DeVille, Dennis J. Keihn
 Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin Cohen, Philip T. Crotty, Charles S. Farrell, Richard Lapchick, Pamela Nichols, Jeanne Rowlands
 Northern Arizona University: Tom Jurich, David Markee, Sam F. McClanahan, Kelly Patton
 Northern Colorado, University of: Robert C. Dickeson, Rosemary Fri, Robert L. Heiny, Robert A. Oliver
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Cary Groth, Keith Hackett, John E. La Tourette, Gerald K. O'Dell, Nancy M. Vedral
 Northern Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowsby, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier
 Northern Michigan University: James B. Appleberry, Richard B. Comley, Harold Dorf, R. Thomas Peters Jr.
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, Richard R. Flanagan
 Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Robert A. Alost, Joseph Carr, Tynes Hildebrand, Greg Sankey
 Northwestern University: Bruce A. Corrie, Frederick Hemke, Ken Kraft, Betsy J. Mosher
 Notre Dame, College of (California): Virginia Werner
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Donna M. Ledwin
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Brian Boulac, Melissa L. Conboy, Joe O'Brien, Richard A. Rosenthal
 Oakland University: Glenn A. Jackson
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, James E. Foels, Patrice A. Milkovich
 Occidental College: Ralph Amey, Lynn Pacala Mehl
 Ohio Northern University: Donn Bennice, Bob Lipp, Sheila K. Wallace
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, James L. Jones, Carol W. Kennedy, Bill Myles, C. J. Slanicka
 Ohio University: James Bruning, Robert Kline, Harold N. McElhane, Peggy J. Pruitt, Shirley Slater
 Ohio Wesleyan University: John A. Martin, David L. Warren
 Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens,

Ronald E. Watson
 Oklahoma State University: Ann A. Baer, John R. Campbell, Gerald M. Lage, Myron Roderick
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, Paul L. Heine, James Jarrett, Bob Moorman
 Olivet College: Susan M. Bujack
 Oneonta State University College: James Baker
 Oregon, University of: Bill Byrne, Gary Gray, James M. O'Fallon, Barbara Walker
 Oregon State University: Dutch Baughman, Patricia M. Drapela, Robert Frank, Lynn Snyder
 Oswego State University College: Charles Davis, Jo Ann Meadows, Alice Struzinsky
 Otterbein College: Elmer W. Yoest

Pace University: Chris Bledsoe
 Pacific, University of the: Bill L. Atchley, Donald Bryan, Edward Leland
 Paine College: Ronnie O. Spry
 Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Nicholas D. Constan Jr., Sheldon Hackney, Paul R. Rubincam Jr., Carolyn J. Schlie
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Tim Curley, Steve A. Garban, Joseph V. Paterno, Ellen L. Perry, Herbert Schmidt, James I. Tarman
 Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode, Herbert J. Lauffer
 Pepperdine University: John Watson, Wayne Wright
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: James P. Gallagher, Ted Taylor, Gloria A. Thompson
 Pittsburg State University: Ellen Carter, Glen D. McLaren, William O. Samuels
 Pittsburgh, University of: John W. Blanton, John O. Bolvin, Edward E. Bozik, Jacqueline Campbell, Walter P. Cummins, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague
 Plattsburg State University College: Peter Luguri, Charles O. Warren
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Fred J. Grieman, Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: James T. Covert, Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Robert W. Lockwood
 Potsdam State University College: Charles Foster, Charles Hunter
 Prairie View A&M University: Harold S. Bonner, George H. Stafford
 Princeton University: Amy Campbell, Robert J. Myslik, Eric L. Stein
 Principia College: E. Lawrence Gerber
 Providence College: Rev. John F. Cunningham, John M. Marinatto
 Purdue University: Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, George S. King Jr., Philip E. Nelson, Glenn Tompkins

Queens College (New York): Richard Wettan

Radford University: Valiant W. Mah, Chuck Taylor
 Ramapo College: Kenneth McBryde
 Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Helmut Werner
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith Burling
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
 Rhode Island, University of: McKinley Boston, Edward D. Eddy, Eleanor R. Lemaire, Albert H. Taubman
 Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
 Rhodes College: Charles J. Gordon, Sybil R. Todd
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, Jim Harris, Martha E. Hawthorne, John R. May, Steve Moniaci
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone
 Rider College: Martin P. Devlin III, Alan R. Sumutka, Viola Udy
 Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison
 Robert Morris College: Robert D. McBee, Edward A. Nicholson, Robert W. Norberg
 Rochester, University of: Jeffrey Vennell, Joyce S. Wong
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti
 Roger Williams College: Patricia A. Beagan, Dwight F. Datcher
 Rollins College: Ed Borsoi, Gordon E. Howell
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Malcolm G. McLaren, Nancy Mitchell, Paul R. Vitek
 Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski, James H. Ramsey

Sacred Heart University: Henry W. Krell
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.
 St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
 St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra
 St. Bonaventure University: Very Rev. Mathias Doyle, Lawrence J. Weise
 St. Cloud State University: Dianne Glowatzke, Arthur F. Grachek, Morris Kurtz, Scott Mortrude
 St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Frank Pergolizzi
 St. John's University (New York): George R. Bisacca, John W. Kaiser, Richard J. Krempecki, Kathleen Meehan
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Frederick R. Berger
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia, Paul Hightower
 St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye
 St. Louis University: Albert E. Bender Sr., Kelly O'Connell, Joe R. Yates
 St. Mary's College (California): Richard Mazzuto, William McLeod
 St. Mary's College (Indiana): Maureen A. Harty, Jo-Ann E. Nester

St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Don W. Olson
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine
 St. Olaf College: William G. Thornton
 St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi
 St. Peter's College: Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn, William A. Stein
 St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder
 St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota): Frank Mach
 Salem State College: John D. Galaris
 Salisbury State University: Dean Burroughs, William E. Lide, David L. Parker, Michael Vienna
 Salve Regina College: Bro. Michael Reynolds
 Sam Houston State University: Martin J. Anisman, Tom Davis, E. Rex Isham, Ron Randleman
 Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood
 San Diego, University of: Author E. Hughes, Thomas Innacone. A. W. Russ
 San Diego State University: Jayne Hancock, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller
 San Francisco, University of: Rev. Robert A. Sunderland
 San Francisco State University: William E. Partlow
 San Jose State University: Gail Fullerton, Randall G. Hoffman, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman
 Santa Clara University: James I. Briggs, Thomas J. O'Connor
 Savannah State College: Charles J. Elmore
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
 Seattle Pacific University: Wesley Lingren, Keith R. Phillips
 Seton Hall University: Sue C. Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr., John J. Mitchell Jr.
 Shaw University: Ernest L. Pickens
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss, James G. Pribula
 Siena College: William J. Kirsch
 Simmons College: Sheila Brown
 Simpson College: Ian Grover, John F. Sirianni
 Skidmore College: Matthew P. Galvin
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, William C. Lennox
 Smith College: Linda C. Hackett
 Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey
 South, University of: Mary Susan L. Cushman
 South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried
 South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Dick Bestwick, Sterling R. Brown, King Dixon II, William F. Putnam, Harold A. White
 South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: Thomas G. Pucci, Olin B. Sansbury Jr.
 South Carolina State College: Oscar P. Butler Jr., Willis C. Ham, Charlene Myers, Albert E. Smith
 South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary

Mock
 South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson, Fred M. Oien
 South Florida, University of: Paul S. Griffin, Stewart W. Schneller
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
 Southeast Missouri State University: Lana G. Flynn, Joseph H. Low Jr., Richard A. McDuffie
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Bob Butler, G. Warren Smith
 Southeastern Massachusetts University: John R. Brazil, Robert A. Dowd
 Southern California, University of: Leslie Daland, Margaret Gatz, Barbara A. Hedges, Edward Lawler, Michael B. McGee, James H. Zumberge
 Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Anthony Martone
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, Jim Hart, Margaret Matthias, Charlotte West
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: James R. Buck, Cynthia Jones, John Meisel, Alan Ortegren
 Southern Indiana, University of: Donald Bennett, Charles J. Bertram
 Southern Maine, University of: Richard A. Costello, Remo H. Riciputi
 Southern Methodist University: Barbara Camp, Cynthia Patterson, C. Paul Rogers III, Doug Single
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Clyde N. Ginn, Aubrey K. Lucas, Louis Marciani, H. C. McLellan, Sidney E. Weatherford
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Robert Cobbins
 Southern Utah State College: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop, David R. Braegger, Michael Richards
 Southwest Baptist University: John A. Bryant, Gary De Bauche, James L. Sells
 Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, Marshall Gordon, Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Billy M. Miller, Linda K. Sharp, Jerome H. Supple
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Louie Alford, Ray P. Authement, Gerard L. St. Martin
 Springfield College: Bridget Belgiovine, Edward Bilik, Edward S. Steitz
 Stanford University: Ferdinand A. Geiger, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Sadie Allison, Dianne Baker, Harold G. Hill, William R. Johnson, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
 Stetson University: Robert Weickel Jr.
 Stockton State College: George L. James

Stony Brook, State University of New York: Helen Lemay, Sandra Weeden

Suffolk University: James E. Nelson

Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum

Swarthmore College: Eleanor K. Hess, Robert E. Williams

Sweet Briar College: Nenah E. Fry, Bonnie Kestner

Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, Louis G. Marcoccia, Doris R. Soladay

Tampa, University of: G. Jeffrey Klepfer, Bruce A. Samson, Bill L. Wall

Temple University: Joseph W. Marshall, Charles Theokas

Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Ron Area, Robert V. Brennan, Frederick W. Obear, Paul J. Watson

Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Lamar Alexander, Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Dru Hancock, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Philip A. Scheurer

Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Bettye Giles, Don McLeary, Margaret Perry

Tennessee State University: George W. Cox, Bernard G. Crowell, William Thomas

Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David L. Larimore

Texas, University of, Arlington: William C. Bibb, Pete Carlon, Bill Ross, Wendell H. Nedderman

Texas, University of, Austin: Leon Black, William H. Cunningham, DeLoss Dodds, Beverly Hadaway, Patricia Stewart Harris, Craig Helwig, Donna A. Lopiano, Mary C. Rainey, Ed Sharpe, James W. Vick, James G. Worley

Texas, University of, El Paso: Brad W. Hovious, Robert D. Tollen

Texas, University of, Pan American: Sam R. Odstrcil

Texas, University of, San Antonio: Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, Bobby Thompson

Texas A&I University: Pence Dacus, Manuel L. Ibanez

Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair, John David Crow, William H. Mobley, Karl P. Mooney, Tedi Zalesky

Texas Christian University: Carolyn Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Mel Thomas, William E. Tucker, Frank Windegger

Texas Southern University: Porter Robinson

Texas Tech University: Ronny Barnes, T. Jones, Robert W. Lawless, Jeannine McHaney, Taylor McNeel, Robert M. Sweazy

Texas Woman's University: Joanne Kuhn, G. Ann Uhler, Frank Vitro

Thiel College: Dale A. Liston

Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, Frank E. Horton, Tim Selgo, John W. Stoepler, Marnie W. Swift

Towson State University: James E. Ewig, Bill Hunter, Nance Reed

Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh

Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton

Trinity University (Texas): Gene Norris

Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Jack Hawkins Jr., Robert E. Stewart

Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo

Tulane University: Milton Fingerman, Chester S. Gladchuk, Eamon Kelly, Tom Peters, Gary R. Roberts

Tulsa, University of: Rick Dickson, Barry A. Kinsey

Tuskegee University: James A. Martin

U.S. Air Force Academy: James C. Andrus, Col. John J. Clune, Col. Ruben A. Cubero

U.S. International University: Al J. Palmiotto

U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow

U.S. Military Academy: Capt. Sally Jo Hall, Lt. Gen. Dave R. Palmer, Carl F. Ullrich, Col. Albert Vanderbush

U.S. Naval Academy: Jack Lengyel, Richard D. Mathieu

Upsala College: Michael J. Walsh

Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd

Utah, University of: Fern Gardner, Larry R. Gerlach, Christopher P. Hill

Utah State University: Stanford Cazier, E. Kaye Hart, Michael Parent, Rod Tueller

Utica College: Michael K. Simpson, James A. Spartano

Valdosta State College: Tommy J. Thomas

Valparaiso University: Bruce Berner, Alan F. Harre, Richard P. Koenig, William L. Steinbrecher

Vanderbilt University: John W. Cropp, Ken Hudgens, Charles A. Kiesler, Roy Kramer, Joe B. Wyatt

Vassar College: Richard G. Becker

Vermont, University of: Rosalind E. Andreas, Narbeth R. Emmanuel, Richard A. Farnham, Ben R. Forsyth, Sally Guerett, Denis E. Lambert

Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Mary Anne Dowling

Virginia, University of: W. James Copeland, D. Alan Williams

Virginia Commonwealth University: Geraldine Garner, Alfreeda Goff, Richard L. Sander

Virginia Military Institute: Col. Thomas W. Davis, Eric Hyman

Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Stephen J. Horton, Sharon McCloskey, James I. Robertson Jr.

Virginia State University: Leon W. Bey, Patrick Carter, Arnold R. Henderson, Paulette Walker Johnson

Virginia Wesleyan College: Donald M. Forsythe

Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke

Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline

Wake Forest University: Thomas K. Hearn Jr., Gene E. Hooks, Edwin G. Wilson

Wartburg College: Darold F. Wolff

Washburn University: Larry D. Blumberg, Robert L. Burns, Janet Degginger, Richard A. Johanningmeier
 Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Milo R. Lude
 Washington and Jefferson College: John L. Luckhardt
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry, Cinda L. Rankin, Michael F. Walsh
 Washington College (Maryland): Geoffrey M. Miller
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Bobbi Bonace, Jim Livengood, Marcia L. Saneholtz
 Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, John M. Schael
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapinan
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Dorothy E. Dreyer, Christ Petrouleas
 Weber State College: Robert H. DeBoer, Richard Hannan, Richard Ordyna, Leland Sather
 Wellesley College: Virginia L. Evans
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesleyan University: John S. Biddiscombe, Herb Kenny
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Susan W. Lubking, Alan R. Platt, John C. Tachovsky
 West Georgia College: Jimmy C. Stokes, Tom Virgets
 West Texas State University: Bruce A. Grimes, Flavius C. Killebrew, Ed D. Roach
 West Virginia University: Kittie J. Blakemore, Forest J. Bowman, Ed Pastilong, Jon A. Reed
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Myron L. Coulter, Betty J. Peele, Bobby N. Setzer
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Western Illinois University: James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson, Helen Smiley, Ralph H. Wagoner
 Western Kentucky University: Jimmy Feix, Pam Herriford, Thomas C. Meredith
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr., Richard A. Clower, Carol A. Fritz
 Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, Chauncey J. Brinn, Leland Byrd, Ed Edwards, Diether Haenicke, Andrew Rivers
 Western New England College: Eric Geldart
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd, Sam Shellhamer
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Lynn Miller, Chad Yowell
 Whittier College: Sherry Calvert, David A. Jacobs
 Wichita State University: Martin M. Perline, Tom Shupe
 Widener University: Bruce Bryde, Beverly A. Reilly
 Wilkes University: Philip Wingert
 William and Mary, College of: John Conlee, John H. Randolph, Mildred B. West
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant

Winston-Salem State University: Clarence E. Gaines, William J. Rice
 Winthrop College: Robert H. Breakfield, Thomas N. Hickman, Steve Vacendak
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Charles A. Ihrke, David L. Outcalt, Daniel J. Spielmann
 Wisconsin, University of, LaCrosse: Tom H. Wonderling
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Ted Finman, Alan Fish, Pat Richter, Ade L. Sponberg
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Bud K. Haidet, William A. Raabe
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Lynn King
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: George Chryst
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Elizabeth Oostendorp, Judy Wilson
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Sonja Kung, Cal Kuphall, Nancy Page
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: William L. Myers
 Wittenberg University: Virginia H. Lucas, Robert E. Rosencrans
 Wofford College: W. Ray Leonard, Daniel B. Morrison Jr.
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Nan Nichols, Alvin J. Van Wie
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann, Paige E. Mulhollan, Peggy L. Wynkoop
 Wyoming, University of: David L. Baker, Joseph R. Geraud, Dan Viola

Xavier University (Ohio): Rev. Albert J. DiUlio, Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Earl J. Kronenberger, E. Laurie Massa, Janice B. Walker

Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Harold E. Woodsum Jr.
 Youngstown State University: Joseph F. Malmisur, Martin J. O'Connell, Pauline Saternow

Conference Members

American South Athletic Conference: Douglas P. Abel, Craig Thompson
 Association of Mid-Continent Universities: Jerry A. Ippoliti, Jon A. Steinbrecher
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Eugene F. Corrigan, Jonathan B. LeCrone, Tom Mickle, David V. Thompson, Delores S. Todd
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich, Cindy Mazda
 Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, David R. Gavitt
 Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gautt, Carl C. James
 Big Sky Conference: Sharon M. Holmberg, Ronald D. Stephenson
 Big South Conference: Tom Collins, George F. Sasser

Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Phyllis L. Howlett, Kevin Weiberg
 Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, James Haney, Paula Y. Smith
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan
 *Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ollie Bowman, Daniel E. Doss
 City University of New York Athletic Conference: Michael Steuerman
 College Athletic Conference: William L. Huyck
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz
 Colonial Athletic Association: Timothy Dillon, Thomas E. Yeager
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf
 East Coast Conference: John B. Carpenter
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Dan Ghormley
 Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Vern L. Norris
 Great Lakes Valley Conference: Richard F. Scharf
 *Great Northwest Conference: Elwood B. Hahn
 Gulf South Conference: G. E. Moran
 *Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 High Country Athletic Conference: Margie McDonald
 Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why
 Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: William D. Gurowitz, Constance Hurlbut, Jeffrey H. Orleans
 Lone Star Conference: Shirley Morton
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Richard J. Ensor, Mel Narol, Wendy Gates Troxel
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph McFillen, R. Dale Smith
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig, Jamie McCloskey
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Nathan N. Salant
 Midwest Athletic Conference for Women: Diane Fairchild
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph L. Shively
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Daniel B. DiEdwardo, Bret A. Gilliland
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
 Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin, Joseph F. Mitch
 New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Leete Jr.
 New England Women's 8: Jane Betts
 New Jersey Athletic Conference: Gregory Lockard
 New South Women's Athletic Conference: Blaine Hughes
 New York Collegiate Athletic Conference: Richard Wettan

New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Dolores A. Bogard
 North Atlantic Conference: Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
 North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis M. Collins
 North Star Conference: Arnold D. Fielkow, Susan K. Fielkow
 Northeast Conference: Chris Monasch, Robert Steitz
 Northeast-Ten Conference: Robert E. Burke
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
 Ohio Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
 Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe
 Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Daniel E. Wooldridge
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price
 *Patriot League: Todd Newcomb
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle
 Southeastern Conference: Brad Davis, John R. Gerdy, James L. McCullough, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack
 Southern Conference: Dave Hart Sr., Wright Waters
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: James E. Hawkins
 Southland Conference: Britton B. Banowsky, Don Graham, Lisa Grider, Donald C. Landry
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Allen Archer, Rick Chryst, Fred H. Jacoby, Duane Lindberg, Susan Zinn-Blackwood
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank, R. L. Stockard
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Carol A. Blazina
 Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas, John Iamarino
 Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta
 Trans America Athletic Conference: Lou McCullough
 University Athletic Association: Richard Rasmussen
 West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran
 Western Athletic Conference: Jeff Hurd, Joseph L. Kearney, Dee Anne Menzies
 *Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Otto Breitenbach
 *Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola, Don Wilson
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Max R. Sparger
 Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judy Kruckman
 Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird
 *Yankee Conference: David M. Nelson
 *Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Sara N. McNabb
 American Baseball Coaches Association: Elaine F. Miles, Jerry A. Miles
 American Volleyball Coaches Association: Sandra L. Vivas

American Water Polo Coaches Association: Peter J. Cutino
 Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic, Inc.: Jake O'Donnell,
 Milton Piepul, William C. Sullivan
 College Division Commissioners Association: Patrick R. Damore
 College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas, David Ogrian
 College Swimming Coaches of America, Inc.: Glenn S. Patton
 Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: Jeff Frank
 Intercollegiate Women's Lacrosse Coaches Association: Dee McDonough
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers
 Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame: Joseph M. O'Brien
 National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics: Robert
 Bradley, Richard McGuire, Steve D. Milburn
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J.
 Cleary, Timothy W. Gleason
 National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators: Tim
 Christensen, Dan Davenport, Marleen B. Ingle
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell
 National Soccer Coaches Association: Johnson D. Bowie
 NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Clyde Hart
 United States Fencing Coaches Association: Alfred Peredo
 USA Basketball: Tom McGrath, William L. Wall
 USA Volleyball Association: Debbie Hunter
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Anne Flannery, Betty
 Jaynes

Corresponding Members

Andrus Group, The: Sharon Andrus
 Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: Vannette W. Johnson
 Astro Turf Industries, Inc.: Ed M. Milner, Jim Savoca
 Athletes in Action: Dave Lower
 Charleston, College of: Andrew L. Abrams, William Moore
 Meadowlands Sports Complex: Leslie H. Unger
 Peach Bowl, Inc.: Robert D. Morgan
 Pratt Institute: Eugene Marshall Jr.
 Raycom Management Group: Richard C. Ginanni, Ken Haines, Ann
 Miller
 Southern Colorado, University of: Pat Bottini, Keith Lovin, Robert C.
 Shirley, Larry Thomas

Visitors

Adams State College: Bill Dickey, Bill Fulkerson
 All American Bowl: Pam Vise
 American Council on Education: Sheldon E. Steinbach
 American Institutes for Research: Robert J. Rossi, Robert Sellers
 Austin Travel Corporation: Bob Getchell
 Catawba College: David S. Wood

Centre Group/Capital Centre: Bob Zurfluh
 Chadron State College: Brad Smith
 Coffield Ungaretti Harris & Slavin: Kathy Jones
 Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Dwayne C. Nuzum, Jeff
 Thompson
 Colorado Christian University: James Chancellor, Frank Evans,
 Linda Rush, Joe Wall
 Cotton Bowl Athletic Association: Pamela S. Burnett
 Creative Sports Marketing: Bray Cary
 Educational Testing Service: George Powell
 Elon College: Alan J. White
 Emporia State University: Robert E. Glennen, Bill Quayle
 Erskine College: Bill Lesesne
 Federal Express Orange Bowl: Steven J. Hatchell, Arthur H. Hertz,
 Thomas D. Wood
 Florida Citrus Bowl: Chuck Rohe
 Florida, State University System of: Charles B. Reed
 Fort Lewis College: Troy Bledsoe, Joel M. Jones
 Freedom Bowl: Rob Halvaks
 Georgia College: Mike Peeler
 Grand Canyon University: Carl G. Paetz Jr., Gil Stafford, Bill
 Williams
 Guilford College: J. Phillip Roach
 Harsh, Emily H.
 HOK Sports Facilities Group: Joel Leider, Dick Martin, Rick Martin
 Intercollegiate Athletics Consultants, Inc.: Michael L. Barnes
 International Sports Management, Inc.: Don Lockerbie
 John Hancock Sun Bowl: John Junker
 Kazmaier Associates: Dick Kazmaier, Robert Ruxin
 Knight Commission on Athletics: Christopher B. Morris
 Knight Foundation: Creed Black
 KSG, Inc.: Terry Driscoll
 Lander College: Finis Horne, Larry A. Jackson, Betty H. Williams
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley
 Lincoln Memorial University: Jay Nidiffer
 Louisiana State University, Shreveport: Larry Rambin
 Mesa State College: Jay Jefferson
 Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning: Frank Crosthwait
 Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: David Carrigan, William M.
 Jacka
 Newberry College: Hubert Setzler Jr., Jeff Steele
 Oahu Travel Inc.: Pam Goodman
 Oakland City College: Ron Malin
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Jack Biggar, Roy Coats, Harriman
 Cronk, Millard Davidson, Stanley Hahn, Fred Johnson, Fred
 Soldwedel
 Prime Network - HSE: Jack Stanfield
 Queens College (North Carolina): Dale Layer
 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Wanda E. Brechler

Roe, Robert
 St. Louis Athletic Conference: Walt Schoenke
 St. Rose, College of: Catherine Haker
 Sea World Holiday Bowl: James B. Kuhn, John K. Reid, Gladstone Vinson
 Shepherd College: Vince Gonino, Mike Jacobs
 SMG Sports: Bill Curl
 South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols
 South Carolina, University of, Aiken: J. Lisk, Randy Warrick
 Squire, Sanders & Dempsey: Michael Scott
 Sunkist Fiesta Bowl: C. E. Cooney, Larry Cuning, Kirk Hendrix, Don Meyers
 Tele Planning International, Inc.: Atsushi Fujita, Michihito Jinno, Kosei Kada, Kunimasa Matsuda, Masaru Yanaka
 Thomas More College: Charles J. Bensman
 USF&G Sugar Bowl: Mickey Holmes, Troy Mathieu, Milton Walther
 U.S. Olympic Committee: Jim Page
 United State Sports Academy: Carl R. Miller
 Waynesburg College: Rudy Marisa, Timothy Thyreen
 Western State College (Colorado): William T. Hamilton, Curt Mallory White Jr., John E.

Working News Media

ABC Sports: Jack O'Hara, Steve Solomon
 Amusement Business: Linda L. Deckard
 Associated Press: Denne Freeman, Scott McCartney, David Sams, Doug Tucker
 Athletic Business: Rick Berg
 Athletic Director Magazine: Mike Wegs
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: Furman Bisher, David Davidson
 Austin American-Statesman: Kirk Bohls, Mark Wangrin
 Baltimore Sun: Bill Glauber
 Baton Rouge Morning Advocate: Dave Moorman
 Baton Rouge State-Times: George Morris
 Birmingham News: Alf VanHoose
 Booth Newspapers: John Barton
 Cable News Network: Chris Abel, John Camp, Mike Haley, Martin Koughan, Wells Smith, Gary Ultee, Karen Ultee
 CBS Radio Sports: Robert Kipperman, Frank D. Murphy
 CBS Sports: Len DeLuca, Lynn Harris
 CHE: Ben Weaver
 Chicago Tribune: Skip Myslenski, Ed Sherman
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Doug Lederman
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon
 Daily Oklahoman: Jerry McConnell
 Daily Texas: Kevin Gladden
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Evans Caglase, Juan Garcia, Catharine Krueger, Ivan Maisel, David McNabb, Jeff Miller, Steve

Richardson, Ken Stephens
 Dallas Times Herald: Steve Krauss, Dan Langendorf, Scott M. Reid, Susie Woodhams
 Dayton Daily News: Ritter Collett
 Des Moines Register: Tom Witosky
 Detroit Free Press: Steve Kornacki
 Detroit News: Fred Girard
 Dodge City Globe: Keith Tift
 ESPN: Mike Aresco, Rodney B. Bell, Steve Bornstein, John Domino, Henry Kokojan, Loren Matthews, Rick Mickler, Tom Odjakian, Jimmy Roberts
 Florida Times-Union: Don Yaeger
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jimmy Burch, Ashley Cheshire, Tony Record, Mike Towle
 Gainesville Sun: Jud Magrin
 Greenville News: Dan Foster
 Home News: Brian Vanderbeek
 Houston Chronicle: Al Carter
 Jackson Clarion-Ledger: Mike Knobler, Tim Turner
 Jefferson-Pilot Teleproductions: Michael Burg
 KDFW-TV: Howard Ballou, Tim Park, Kevin Scofield, Bill Swanbeck
 KHOG-TV: Chuck Carney, Paul LeRoy
 KLIF/KPLX Radio: Chuck Schechner
 KMGK Radio: Mark T. Lambert
 KRLD Radio: David Burrall, Chuck Cooperstein, Jan Darwin, Craig Way
 KSEV Radio: Joe Gallagher
 KTVT-TV: Tom Finn
 KXAN-TV: Gary Blankenship, Rick Hayes
 KXAS-TV: Jeff Eliasoph, Fred Watts
 Kansas City Star: Adam Teicher
 Los Angeles Times: Danny Robbins
 Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning
 Monroe News-Star: Bill Campbell, Mark Coomes
 NBC News: Tommy Byrne, Robert Charlap, Jim Cummins, Al Henkel, Holt Holyfield, Don Smith, Larry F. Weidman
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
 National, The: Phil Taylor
 National Public Radio: Glenn Mitchell
 NCAA News: Paula Nelson
 New Orleans Times Picayune: Bob Roesler
 New York Times: Bill Rhoden
 Newsday: Manny Topol
 Omaha World-Herald: Michael Kelly
 Orlando Sentinel: George Diaz
 Palm Beach Post: Tom D'Angelo
 Philadelphia Daily News: Kevin Mulligan
 Philadelphia Inquirer: Frank Dolson, Michael G. Missanelli
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander

Raycom Sports: Dee Ray, Rick Ray
 Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
 Roanoke Times & World-News: Bill Brill
 San Antonio Express-News: Clifford Broyles
 San Antonio Light: Ken Sins
 San Diego Tribune: Tom Cushman
 San Diego Union: Chris Clarey
 Spartanburg Herald-Journal: Ralph Hohman
 Sports Illustrated: Robert Sullivan
 Tampa Tribune: Tom McEwen
 Topeka Capital-Journal: Alan Eskew
 Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson
 Turner Broadcasting System: Kevin O'Malley, Blair Schmidt-Fellner,
 Jim Trahey, John D. Vandegrift
 United Press International: Mike Rabun, David Moffit
 UPI Newspictures: Tim Roberts
 UPI Radio: Greg Echlin
 USA Today: Karen Allen, Steve Wieberg
 Waco Tribune Herald: Dave Campbell
 Washington Post: Mark Asher
 WFAA-TV: David Evans, Brian Jensen, Pete McKeeman, Jack
 Murray, Arnold Payne III, George Riba

84th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 7, 1990

The 84th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, meeting at the Loews Anatole Hotel in Dallas, Texas, January 7-10, 1990, was called to order at 4:40 p.m., with President Albert W. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Witte: Will the delegates please come forward and take your seats. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the 1990 Convention of the NCAA. This is the opening general business session. We are scheduled for divisional sessions tomorrow and then the resumption of the general business session on Tuesday and perhaps Wednesday. We have a very busy time today. The first part is not as exhilarating as the last half, but it is important because many of us are here for the first time and we have to review our procedures and give some indication of what to expect and how to participate in this proceeding.

As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised; and one such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to beginning our business. So I would ask for a motion to adopt the printed program so that we may proceed.

Martin A. Massengale (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I move we adopt the printed program.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I move to amend the agenda by placing Proposal No. 31 ahead of No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, as chair of the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, we support the request to reorder.

[The motion to consider Proposal No. 31 ahead of No. 30 was approved.]

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move the reordering of the legislation amendments dealing with camps and clinics in this order: Proposals 128 and 130 before Nos. 125, 126, 127 and 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

At our conference meeting, there were several questions related to camps and clinics; and it seems to us that it would be more

appropriate to deal with the legislation on definition of a camp and clinic and purpose prior to the other pieces of legislation.

[The motion was approved.]

Thomas L. Jones (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I move to reorder Proposal No. 33 ahead of No. 32.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

John O. Bolvin (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I move that Proposals 26, 27 and 28 be reordered to 27, 28 and 26.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): Mr. Chair, I move to amend the agenda to reorder Proposal 41 before Proposal 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a somewhat unusual request, because Proposal 37 is a Division I roll-call vote and Proposal 41 is scheduled to be a general session common vote. The rationale for the move is that in No. 37, we are amending the cost of attendance and Proposal No. 41 has an impact on what the cost of attendance is. I believe that we ought to be voting on whether to impact the cost of attendance before voting on the Pell Grant increase.

[The motion was defeated.]

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): On behalf of the NCAA Executive Committee, I would like to move the reordering of Proposal No. 54 ahead of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for the change in the order, Mr. President, is that Nos. 52 and 54 deal with sanctions relating to the drug-testing program, either as it exists now or as it might exist with Proposal 53. So, I am suggesting to the Convention that we decide the sanction issue and then decide the issue of year-round drug-testing.

[The motion was approved.]

[The Convention Program was approved as reordered.]

President Witte: As most of you already know, we use Robert's Rules of Order to conduct our proceedings. The rules provide that individual institutions may have their own ordinary procedures, and we have some that are summarized in the Convention Program. Many questions that you might have are answered in that summary. All of our procedures are designed to assure fairness in the discussion of legislation and to encourage everyone to feel free to speak on each issue or any issue that is of interest to the delegate.

However, there are several specific concerns that I think I shall alert you to because the chair intends to apply them, if necessary. One is that we are sensitive to the number of times that an individual speaks on a given issue. Under the rules, you are permitted to speak only twice on a given issue. The time limit, which we also are sensitive to, is 10 minutes for each time. We will try to apply that fairly.

Most of our votes are "eyeball" votes, but I have a poor track record with eyeball votes and sometimes I question my competency in that

regard. Feel free to ask for a count if you, in good faith, believe that I made an error from the voting. But refrain from doing it unless you really do have a serious question in your mind about the voting. As you know, many of our votes are by roll call and that will be explained later. When you wish to speak, please be at the microphone. I anticipate that hereafter they will be numbered and you will be identified by the number of your microphone. Be ready to speak so that we can expedite the discussions. With regard to the general business session, we will use the same procedure for issues that involve all three divisions. Division I will vote first, then II and III. The announcement of results will be postponed until all the divisions have voted.

Now, we should review the voting and speaking privileges. Each institution is entitled to four accredited delegates, and any one of them may vote for the institution. They may exchange voting privileges as they choose. Visiting delegates, and they are identified as delegates whose badges don't have ribbons, may not speak or participate by voting. Conferences with voting privileges have the same rights as active members. For conferences without voting privileges or affiliated organizations without voting privileges, one delegate may speak but not vote.

The "window of reconsideration" has to be addressed. If you are restricted in your division sessions tomorrow and if you want to reconsider any actions, you must do it first thing Tuesday morning at the general business session. Once we get through the consent package, you will be asked if there are any motions to reconsider business from the preceding day and that is your last opportunity to have that done.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

It is now my privilege to identify for you some of the key people at the annual Convention. First, is Karen L. Miller, chair of the Nominating Committee, from California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. The Men's Committee on Committees chair is William D. McHenry from Washington and Lee University. The Women's Committee on Committees chair is Elizabeth Murphey from the University of Georgia. The Voting Committee chair is Marnie W. Swift from University of Toledo. The Committee on Credentials chair is Diane Fairchild of Grinnell College. The Memorial Resolutions Committee chair is Joanne A. Fortunato from Keene State College. I also want to note one change in the listing of the Voting Committee. Lynn Dorn, of North Dakota State University, has replaced Sandra Jerstad, Augustana College (South Dakota) on that committee.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

Now, we will move to the next item, which is a report from the NCAA Council for 1989. To present that report, it is my pleasure to introduce Jack Reardon from Harvard University, who has served on the Council and is retiring from the Council as of this Convention. He

has been an extremely valuable member, particularly in committees dealing with academic issues. It is my pleasure to present to you Jack Reardon, Harvard University.

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): Thank you, President Witte. Members of the Association, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present the report of the 1989 Council for this Convention. This report is required under the provisions of the NCAA Constitution, and it gives the membership the opportunity to challenge any of the Council's actions during the past year. This is a brief summary but incorporates by reference the full report of all Council actions during the year. That full report is available to you in either of two forms. First, The NCAA News publishes after each Council meeting a complete listing of the Council's actions. In 1989, those listings appeared in the issues of the News dated February 8, May 24, September 11 and November 6. Also the printed publication entitled Annual Reports, that is the green publication, contains the abridged minutes of the past year's Council meeting minutes. That is distributed here at the Convention and all are mailed to each member.

The major consideration by the Council in 1989 was to develop the procedures for implementing the new legislative calendar that will go into effect after this Convention. The Council believes the new calendar and the attendant procedures will permit a marked improvement in our legislative activities. The earlier deadlines provide that the time to discuss, massage and improve legislative proposals is extended greatly. The presentation of the legislation, emphasizing statements of both intent and rationale, should be an improvement. All in all, it is the Council's hope that the new process will go a long way toward simplifying and clarifying our somewhat labyrinthian legislative process.

A year ago, this assembly approved the NCAA Manual. That tool assisted in implementing the new legislative procedures. One such procedure must be reported officially to you at this time: The authority of the NCAA Legislative Review Committee to incorporate interpretations in each printing of the Manual. The interpretations that have been recommended by the Legislative Review Committee and approved by the Council through October appear in Appendix C of your Convention Program or Appendix E if you are using the Official Notice publication.

The procedure for accepting a challenge to those also appears in the start of the appendix. If a delegate wants to object to incorporation of any interpretation therein, this is the time to do so. When you accept this report of the Council, you are approving incorporation of all of those interpretations in the Manual.

As always, the work of the Council includes a review of deliberations and recommendations of special committees and standing committees. As you know, we have a number of special committees working on such key issues as amateurism, the membership structure and cost reduction. You will hear from the latter two special committees later in this session. The work of all three of those will be reflected in major

legislation for next year's Convention.

Other highlights of the past year for the Council included the formation and first formal meeting of our new Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Council has high hopes that this committee, over time, will give the NCAA effective advice from the student-athletes themselves regarding the issues in college athletics that most effect them.

We are continuing to enhance the cooperative relationship with the Presidents Commission. The NCAA Administrative Committee now meets with the officers of the Commission at least twice a year. Both groups are informed regularly of the activities of the other. We are interested in assisting the Presidents Commission in any possible way as it continues to attempt to provide an effective role of college and university presidents in athletics policy considerations.

One of the gradual changes, but very, very important, that I think we see in our Council meetings, is the emergence of what might be called a kinder, gentler, friendlier approach to some of our procedures, especially in terms of interpretations, waivers and the like. Even so, someone said yesterday that we might be beginning to call a dog a cat. I tend to view it as a common-sense approach that we are taking. I believe that we can attribute much of that change and approach to our Executive Director Dick Schultz, who is encouraged in that regard by Mr. Witte, our president; the Administrative Committee, and the Council.

I want to say I have enjoyed my four years as a member of the Council. The Council members are serious about their work and courteous to one another. Each of the 44 Council members can air his or her opinions on any subjects. Of course, one might be voted down 43 to 1, which has happened to some of us on occasions. On the other hand, many of us have persuaded a majority of the Council to change their view when nobody expected to see a change. My point is that the NCAA Council and the NCAA staff use a fair amount of flexibility. These are not people wedded to rigid, fixed notions about athletics policies. I must tell you, however, that much of our meeting time is spent dealing with what can be considered only as detail. The meetings can be tedious, and the considerations can range from global and grand to the picayune. We spend many hours in our sessions dealing with interpretation of legislation, membership applications, the application of waiver requests and all the other detail that in the NCAA administrative structure is under the jurisdiction of the Council and the division steering committees. Our decisions in all those matters are reflected in the News and in the Annual Reports, as I indicated in the beginning of my remarks.

President Witte, this completes my summary of the Council's 1989 activities. Tuesday morning, at the beginning of the general business session, there will be a motion to have the Convention accept and approve the Council's full report. On behalf of the Council, I thank you.

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

Joanne A. Fortunato (Keene State College): Mr. Chair and delegates, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. If they are here, I would like for them to stand. They are James Doyle, DePaul University and Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College. The following is a list of those men and women who have passed away during the past year. They are:

Robert Allen, University of Iowa
 J. Kyle Anderson, University of Chicago
 Don Baker, Arizona State University
 Mike Barbato, Louisiana State University
 Earl Henry Blaik, U.S. Military Academy
 Charles Bowser, University of Pittsburgh
 William Brown, Hofstra University
 Herschel Caldwell, Duke University
 Lee Calhoun, Western Illinois University
 Bob Calihan, University of Detroit
 Don R. Clark, University of Southern California
 Harry G. Cockrum, Montana State University
 Lawrence Cooley, University of Cincinnati
 Mike Corgan, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 Theodore J. Cox, Tulane University
 Louis Daddio, Allegheny College
 Fred DeLano, University of Detroit
 Otis Douglas, University of Akron
 Bibb A. Falk, University of Texas, Austin
 Wes Fesler, Ohio State University
 Frederick A. Fitch, Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 Vernon K. Gale, Wayne State University (Michigan)
 Thomas M. Gerrity, Jersey City State College
 Howard C. Gilstrap, University of Texas, Austin
 Tom Harper, Clemson University
 Dan Hill, Jr., Duke University
 Lovette Hill, University of Houston
 William A. Hughes, Brockport State University College
 Milton Hunter, South Carolina State University
 Edward P. Hurt, Morgan State University
 Clarence J. Kline, University of Notre Dame
 Jim Lawson, Stanford University
 Rear Adm. Elliott Loughlin, U.S. Naval Academy
 Gordon F. McCullough, University of Hartford
 Walter T. McLaughlin, St. John's University (New York)
 Frank Medina, University of Texas, Austin
 Odus Mitchell, University of North Texas
 Francis Moriarity, Butler University
 Joe Morrison, University of South Carolina
 Wendell Mosley, University of Oklahoma
 Edward Motley, Virginia Polytechnic University

Walter Nelson, Middlebury College
 Jim Newkirk, Tennessee Technological University
 Chuck Niemi, University of Washington
 Irvin L. Peterson, Nebraska Wesleyan University
 Samuel F. Porch Jr., Glassboro State College
 Laurie Meyers Potter, Western Illinois University
 Katha Quinn, St. John's University (New York)
 Julian C. Reinhardt, University of Southwestern Louisiana
 Allyson Rioux, Sacred Heart University
 Lewis S. Salter, Wabash College
 George Schroth, University of California, Berkeley
 Christopher Scott, University of Chicago
 Doug Scovil, San Diego State University
 Ray Sears, Butler University
 Steve Sebo, University of Virginia
 Henry A. Sherk, University of Kansas
 John Carnegie Sim, Stevens Institute of Technology
 Harry Simester, Drew University
 Pete Stevens, Temple University
 Emmett R. Stuber, Southeast Missouri State University
 Edward A. Sulkowski, Pennsylvania State University
 John L. Summers, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 Lurtis Thompson, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 Oliver M. Thompson, University of District of Columbia
 Samuel Voinoff, Purdue University
 Robert Lee Waters, Western Carolina University
 Robert E. Weingart, Marquette University
 Les Wheeler, Abilene Christian University
 John Wiethe, University of Cincinnati
 Elmer B. Wynne, Colorado School of Mines
 John M. Yovicsin, Harvard University

Please stand and let's observe a moment of silence for those who have passed away. Thank you. If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact a member of the committee or the national office staff.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COST REDUCTION

President Witte: We now will proceed to the two special reports mentioned earlier by Jack Reardon. Each person will present a brief status report on the deliberations of these committees. It is first my privilege to introduce the chair of the Special Committee on Cost Reduction, Gene Corrigan, commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): From the beginning, the committee felt it was important that we look at every conceivable way to cut costs and save money. The practical solution is always in our minds, recognizing that practicality and competitive balance cannot always be in intercollegiate athletics. We knew that

reaching agreement on the details would be a challenge. But the basic premise that we need to create legislation to save us from ourselves has overwhelming support.

The last attempt at cost reduction was directed mostly at nonrevenue sports and failed to produce any meaningful legislation. Thus, it was clear that whatever we recommended should include cost-saving measures in all sports, including those that provide the revenue. The committee was divided into subgroups, which we felt might best represent areas where savings could be effective: financial aid, recruiting, staffing policies and competitive policies, which is a short way of saying keeping up with the Joneses.

The work of these subcommittees provided the basis for the survey that was distributed to the membership in early November. The following is a summary of the subcommittee reports and survey results, and I have to say each of these received support from at least two-thirds of the respondents.

Under financial aid, the committee reviewed various proposals regarding need-based student-athletes financial aid grants. After having various need-based proposals, it was noted that in most cases student-athletes would receive less financial aid under a need-based system than under the current financial aid structure when the Pell Grant is included. The committee declined to endorse any of the need-based proposals for a number of reasons, not the least of which would be that such things as timing, professional judgment, verification of data and defined cost of attendance varied among institutions, and additional administrative complexities and procedures would be placed on the institutions and specifically on student financial aid officers. Thus, we shall recommend across-the-board reductions in the number of athletics grants-in-aid in all sports. These numbers have not yet been determined. The subject is in need of further study, but we have looked most seriously into reductions of five and 10 percent.

Under recruiting, the subcommittee recommended proposals that would limit the number of coaches who could recruit prospective student-athletes off campus, placing restrictions on the phone calls, additional limits for on- and off-campus contacts, reduced time periods for contacts and evaluations, establishing recruiting periods in all other sports, and placing further limitations on the types of recruiting materials that may be sent to prospective student-athletes. The results of the survey indicate that the membership supports these recommendations.

Staffing policies: The subcommittee proposed limitations on coaching staffs in all sports in all divisions. The subcommittee currently is developing recommendations. Since the survey did not deal with numbers on this issue, we do not have specific recommendations to report at this time.

Under competitive policies, the committee recommended additional limits on the length of seasons and the number of contests. The survey results indicated that the present 26-week limit could be

reduced and the survey supported limits on team travel, athletics publications, as well as limitations on the overall size of the squads and on travel squads.

It is our intention to walk our recommendations through the various conferences at their spring meetings. The purpose is to give each of you a shot at approval of the proposed legislation before we put it into final form for the 1991 Convention. Financing intercollegiate athletics is a major problem, and it is our hope that we can create solutions that will be acceptable to the membership. During the next few months, you will be receiving information from the committee that will require a response. Do not let us down, so that next year when we walk into the Convention with a series of cost-saving proposals, they will have a chance. Thank you. (Applause)

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

President Witte: Our next report is from the chair pro tem of the Special Committee to Review the Membership Structure. It is my pleasure to introduce Judy Sweet, who will make that report. As you know, she is athletics director at the University of California, San Diego, and also the NCAA secretary-treasurer.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): Thank you. I am pleased to present this report on the status of our special committee's work, but I do so with some humility and with great respect for our chair, Fred Jacoby. I am serving as chair pro tem of the committee at Fred's request during his recovery from surgery, and I am happy to report that Fred will reclaim the chair when the committee holds its next meeting in mid-February. (Applause) Fred, I think that reaction tells you how happy we all are with your remarkable recovery and we are delighted to welcome you back.

In planning for the 18 months of the National Forum, the NCAA Presidents Commission early in 1987 identified the NCAA membership structure as one of the topics to be discussed during the Forum. It was one of the featured topics in the June 1988 session in Orlando, where several speakers and participants suggested the formation of a special committee with diverse membership to thoroughly review this topic. In its August, 1988 meeting, the NCAA Council authorized the appointment of a special blue-ribbon committee to address the membership structure issues.

The committee includes very capable representatives of all the divisions and subdivisions. We have 17 members, five from Division I-A, three from I-AA and two from I-AAA: four from Division II, and three from Division III.

The special committee's charge was to study the various concerns regarding the Association's current membership structure, including, No. 1, the desirability and feasibility of greater federation; No. 2, the steady growth of the Division I membership, and No. 3, multidivision classification. No. 4 was the concept of a Division I-AAA football classification.

The committee held its first meeting in November 1988 and has held several meetings since then, including hearings with conference commissioners and directors of athletics, representing the various constituencies. The committee has reviewed information from the National Forums as well as the philosophies of all three divisions and has established a liaison relationship with the cost reduction special committee for information sharing.

While it appears that all three divisions can be strengthened with some restructuring, the committee felt that the initial focal point should be the strengthening of Division I. The committee has reflected on the Division I philosophy statement with its references to broad-based sports sponsorship; the offering of extensive opportunities for participation in varsity intercollegiate athletics, for both men and women, and regional and national competitive excellence and prominence. As we announced in the December 20th issue of *The NCAA News*, we are not at a point in our deliberations that we can report specific recommendations. We continue to have subcommittees working on some issues, and we will not review our final report and recommendations until our February meeting.

We then intend to discuss our recommendations with a number of constituent groups in the membership, and we will submit a report to the Presidents Commission and the Council at their April meetings. It is our intention that final recommendations will be voted upon in the Convention one year from now.

I would like to share with you the basic concepts that we are considering. First, the criteria for membership in Division I: In concept, we believe that the Division I membership is the most diverse of all of the three divisions. It is not a matter of Division I being "too large;" it is a matter of vastly dissimilar athletics programs and vastly dissimilar commitments to those programs that is then reflected in voting on key issues. We believe that there must be criteria for Division I membership that will assure greater similarity in programs and commitment to the top level of college athletics competition. Profiles of Division I institutions have been reviewed in regard to sports sponsorship, championships participation, seating capacity of arenas, basketball attendance, granting of financial aid awards and scheduling patterns. All of this information has been very helpful in understanding the scope of Division I programs.

Secondly, legislative autonomy: We generally agree that the trend toward greater voting autonomy in the Association's divisions and subdivisions should continue. Our Convention business has been handled more efficiently as that trend has progressed, but more can be done. We will propose steps toward that goal.

Thirdly, multidivision classification and multidivision eligibility for championships: Fundamentally, our committee is opposed to multidivision classification. We do recognize, however, there may be a situation or two in which an institution or a full division may have to be eligible for a championship when one otherwise would not be available to its student-athletes. The special committee also has

discussed the differences in competitive equity of institutions placing a sport in a division lower than its membership classification, compared to those situations where a sports team competes in a higher division. We are working on recommendations that will move us closer to the true purpose of federation, of a belief in the fundamental philosophy of the division in which the institution is a member.

Fourth, enhancement of Division II membership: While Division II has a clear philosophy, one that is appropriate for many institutions, and while it is growing in membership, the committee feels that it can be made more attractive. We will propose significant steps to do that.

Fifth, distribution of revenues: We are keenly aware of the effects that revenue distribution and availability of resources in general have on the membership-structure issues. Toward that end, the committee will forward to the new advisory committee working in that area a number of concepts to assure that the revenues resulting from the new television contract will be used in ways that benefit all members of the NCAA and that do not exacerbate the existing structural problems, especially as they relate to those divergent interests and program commitments in Division I.

Those are the major concepts in our current deliberations. The committee is aware of the importance of its assignment and is sensitive to the anxieties created in circumstances when change may be an outcome. Our recommendations will suggest what we feel could be needed changes based on extensive review of pertinent information. Our goal is to make recommendations that are in the best interest of the total membership. This could involve little or no change for some institutions and greater change for others.

Now, in early discussions, we determined, where feasible, to have a phasing-in period to allow potentially impacted institutions some time to meet our suggested criteria. With a strong representation of all the divisions and subgroups on the committee, there has been and will continue to be a sincere and strong effort to seek out and to consider all viewpoints.

There are significant issues that must be addressed in our structure. I urge your thoughtful evaluation of our recommendations as we proceed toward the 1991 Convention. Thank you.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION

President Witte: Now, we come to a feature of the opening session that began in 1988. It has been so well received that it will now be an annual practice. I think the membership clearly appreciates the opportunity to have our executive director give an annual summary of our condition in the Association and in intercollegiate athletics in general. So may I introduce to you now for his 1990 state of the Association address, our Executive Director Dick Schultz.

Richard D. Schultz: Mr. President and delegates, welcome to the 1990 NCAA Convention. I would first like to make some general comments about my activities on behalf of the Association this past

year and give you an update on some ongoing projects, provide some thoughts on some of the legislative issues that you will be considering at this Convention and conclude with some comments on my perspectives of intercollegiate athletics in America today.

During this past year, I have traveled 175 days on behalf of the Association. Forty of those days have been on your college campuses at your request; 18 of those days have been with conferences; 80 have been at NCAA meetings, including the Presidents Commission, NCAA Council and Executive Committee, and 37 days were spent at things such as Congressional and Senate hearings, symposiums, and representing the Association in special events and speaking to media groups and the general public. That will give you a feel of how far-flung our Association is. Those 175 days covered over 250,000 miles for an average of about 4,800 miles a week.

We soon will have a new address for the national office. The new building that is under construction that will be leased by the Association is scheduled to be completed in early February, with a tentative move-in date of February 23rd. Some of us feel that might be a little optimistic. A national Visitors Center will be a part of that new office building, and that is scheduled to open on September 1, 1990. Bob Sprenger of our staff, who has the responsibility of designing and developing the center, is here at this Convention and will be available by the display area in the outer lobby to answer any questions that you may have about the Visitors Center. We would urge that when your travel brings you close to the Kansas City area that you make a special effort to see this center when it is opened. We think you will find it will be a dynamic salute to intercollegiate athletics.

The NCAA Foundation is developing well under the direction of Robert Khayat, who was appointed as president of the Foundation last spring. Robert is the former vice-chancellor for public affairs and professor of law at the University of Mississippi. Perhaps you saw President Bush's announcement about the Foundation on New Year's Day. The President is as excited about the opportunities and the potential of this Foundation as we are. It fits quite nicely with his own points-of-light program. You can be expecting the President to make future announcements regarding this Foundation.

One of the primary objectives of the Foundation is to develop resources that will fund all NCAA scholarships, making those dollars available to be returned to the membership. There will be special continued emphasis on scholarships for women and ethnic minorities, especially in the areas of athletics administration. We hope to expand the scholarship program for undergraduates who have exhausted their institutional aid but have not graduated. We have provided financial assistance to more than 150 athletes in that program the past two years.

The Foundation also will provide research funds, especially in the areas of athletics injury and drug- and alcohol-related research. The Foundation also is working with the White House to make outstanding

athletes from your programs available in the summer to work with young people in each state, with a special emphasis on drug education and academic motivation. Robert Khayat also is in attendance at this Convention and will be around especially in the display area to answer any questions that you might have regarding the Foundation.

At this time I would like to direct your attention to some of the legislative items that will be decided at this Convention. First of all, it is very important that you pass Proposal No. 24 dealing with the public disclosure of graduation rates. Both the Senate and the House are waiting to see what happens at this Convention. If 24 is not passed, I can assure you that Federal legislation soon will follow. This is a responsibility that should not be delegated to the Federal government; because if it is, it will be only the first step in the Federal regulation of intercollegiate athletics. This proposal will also help to eliminate some of the myths surrounding athletes in academics.

I also urge you to pass No. 26, dealing with Proposition 42, and No. 28. Since the last Convention, I have spent a considerable amount of time with my counterparts at SAT, ACT and ETS regarding their concern with the use of these tests in determining initial eligibility. They feel that while the current use of the test is not appropriate, there are appropriate ways to use these tests in conjunction with the core-curriculum requirement. They have promised to have several new options available to the membership by the next Convention. The passage of one of these proposals will either curtail or delay the implementation of No. 42. This will provide more time to discuss and review these new procedures. The delay also will allow the completion of the five-year study of Proposition 48 so that that information can be a part of any new decisions. No one wants strong academic standards more than I do. Those standards must be fair and not limit access to certain segments of our population.

No. 30 presents a resolution that deals with cutbacks in the length of seasons other than football and basketball and presents specific legislation for each of those sports. You may decide to amend those proposals, but I urge you to preserve the principles of this legislation. Recent studies and athletes themselves are telling us that they don't have enough time during the season to be the type of student they would like to be. They don't have enough time in the off-season to do the things that other students do. This is only the first step necessary to reduce the time pressure on our student-athletes.

No. 32 relating to the summer school aid is long overdue. We have had similar proposals like this in the past that have failed. It is time to get this in our rule book.

I also urge you to consider Proposal 53 and others that will stiffen penalties for the use of performance-enhancing drugs. We can point with pride to the drug-testing program that we have had in effect for a number of years, but I still maintain we are catching only the dumb ones. The year-round testing provided by the Association is the next step in curtailing this type of thing.

I hope you will look favorably on Proposals 83 through 85, which

provide new ways of dealing with our Olympic athletes. These are proposals that are the result of many meetings between our amateurism committee and representatives of the USOC. This legislation is only the first step in adjusting and updating some of our eligibility rules.

As you are aware, we have been quite successful in the recent television negotiations for televising NCAA championships. The contract with CBS will generate \$1 billion over the next seven years, and that will provide a tremendous opportunity as well as a challenge. But equally as exciting is the fact that CBS will televise 16 championships in addition to the Final Four. This represents an increase from six to 17 of our championships that will be aired on network television.

We are continuing to negotiate and explore with cable entities and other possibilities. In the near future, we hope to have close to 35 of our championships on television representing all three divisions. Women's events have been enhanced greatly with these new contracts, which also will include the airing of a number of women's in-season basketball games by CBS for the first time. This will be a landmark situation, because it will be the first time that women's basketball has been aired on network television. The rights fees for these games are not a part of the NCAA contract, but will be negotiated individually with the participating schools by CBS.

In announcing the CBS contract, I challenge the membership to conceive new and creative methods of distributing these revenues. I issued that same challenge to the Executive Committee, which has the final authority in determining the distribution formula. It has responded by appointing a special committee to advise it in developing new concepts. I also have suggested that this group hold hearings in various locations and encourage both in-person and written suggestions. You have written suggestions and feel free to continue to send those to me; I will make sure they get to the committee. The dates and sites of the hearings will be announced sometime in the near future.

We should review these new dollars as a real opportunity to create major reform. Let's go back to playing for the trophy. Let's eliminate the incentive to cheat because of dollars. Let's reduce the pressure on coaches and athletes. Let's eliminate the comment about the \$300,000 free throw. Let's reward integrity, quality education and good graduation rates. We must reorder a strong commitment to intercollegiate athletics through broad-based programs. Let's make sure that it doesn't cost the school to participate in an NCAA championship by improving the expense allocations. Let's add to Divisions II and III block grants so those schools can compete in an NCAA championship and be guaranteed full transportation and per diem expenses. We have a unique opportunity with this new concept. We can't afford to lose it.

This leads me to my final topic, the state of intercollegiate athletics in America today. For the past 2½ years, I have been talking about the positive things in intercollegiate athletics and urging you, the

membership, to do exactly the same. Most reactions have been good, but some have called me a Pollyanna. I still maintain that the majority of things in intercollegiate athletics are good and positive. Regardless, we are what we are perceived to be; and today, the general public, as well as our faculties and our deans, feel that colleges and universities are not doing a good job of controlling our athletics programs.

In other words, the model is not working. If the model is not working, it is time to develop a new one. Part of my responsibilities as your executive director is to provide leadership and direction to this organization. I intend to do just that. I realize that some of my thoughts will not be appreciated and probably will be misunderstood by others. I think that we all have to realize that when we talk about changes, there are winners and losers, and everyone has to give up something. But it is time to take stock of what we have created. Let's save the positives, quickly eliminate the negatives and let's develop a new innovative approach for athletics that places it in perspective and allows athletics to be a vital and honorable part of higher education.

The basis for any new model has to be trust and integrity. In our own Manual, we have a statement of basic purpose that says, "The competitive athletics programs of member institutions are designed to be a vital part of the educational system. A basic purpose of this Association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body and, by so doing, retain a clear line of demarcation between intercollegiate athletics and professional sports." Later, the Manual goes on to say, "It is the responsibility of each member institution to control its intercollegiate athletics program in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Association."

Simply stated, this means that academic integrity and rules compliance should occupy a prominent place in any new model. In a new model, each institution has to make a commitment to a comprehensive compliance program. To insure this, it is important that each institution's chief executive officer appoint a senior administrator as compliance coordinator. The conference grants should be expanded with the provision that conferences must make a provision to further enhance compliance services offered to their members in addition to the legislative services approach that is more commonly a part of the conference programs. The first step will be to participate in the voluntary certification program that we will be instituting in the next few months. For the first two years, this will be in the form of a pilot study, with the end result being the certification of those participating. Our compliance staff will be working with each volunteer institution in developing a plan that will provide that school's athletics programs with a certification procedure. The certification program will compare an institution's coaches and athletes with the rest of the student body, faculty and staff.

Comparisons will be made in the areas of admissions, academic

progress, graduation rates and conduct. It also will require a commitment to compliance as well as academic and career counseling programs. We have already received a large number of volunteers for this program, and we hope that we can include at least two from each conference as well as a number of independents.

Academic emphasis and integrity has to be a vital part of any new model. We must guarantee sound educational principles in all phases of our athletics operations. It is important that we have student-athletes, not athlete-students. It is important that we maintain the initial-eligibility rules, even if we declare freshmen ineligible. I am not at this time advocating freshman ineligibility as a part of this new model, but I strongly urge the membership to carefully study the pros and cons during this next year.

The new model must guarantee quality academic advice in the sports programs, including tutorial services, training in basic study skills and time management. Drug and alcohol education and counseling and regular review and evaluation of academic progress has to be included.

Education is our business. It has to come first. Any new model must drastically reduce off-campus recruiting. This solves a number of problems that are occurring, many of the integrity issues as well as some of the cost-reduction concerns. It is absolutely ridiculous that we allow six off-campus visits. We hire presidents, commissioners, faculty and coaches with far fewer interviews. We need further restrictions on the number of coaching staff members allowed to travel and recruit as well as shorter recruiting periods. We should establish early signing dates in all sports and significantly restrict telephone recruiting. Let's put some dignity back in the way we conduct our business.

A new model must reduce pressure on coaches. Let's consider a tenure program for coaches on a basis comparable to the faculty. Initial contracts will be for five years with no termination except for rules violations or other ethical or moral considerations. Coaches would be subjected to review based on previously established criteria and granted tenure, a one-year extension, or release based on the outcome of that review. Coaches would not be allowed to break the contract or move to a different institution during that initial five-year period of time. With a program like this, perhaps salaries could be brought more in line with the faculty because of the added security.

When we speak of reducing pressure, we have to consider and cannot forget the athlete. The release of pressure starts by reducing time demands. We must not only reduce time demands when it comes to the length of season and the number of contests, but we also must place limits on the amount of practice time in and out of season for all sports, including organized off-season condition programs.

We also need to address other concerns regarding our student-athletes. We are going to recruit these people and bring them into our programs. We need to provide additional support services and resources. Athletes should have the opportunity to determine the

professional sports value through your campus career-counseling panel. They should be allowed to enter the draft and evaluate their financial worth without penalty. This also would reduce the efforts of the unscrupulous sports agent. Our professional draft rules should be the same in all sports. They are not now. Let's permit institutions to provide athletes all supplies required by the professor and approved by the faculty athletics representative. Let's provide financial aid in Division I up to the cost of attendance, regardless of need. Let's establish a emergency loan system for the needy athlete. Let's provide transportation expenses home for those athletes who have to forego vacation because of athletics participation.

We need to continue to review our rules for the elite Olympic athlete, including trust funds that are administered by national governing bodies. We should consider an endowment fund that would permit a small cash bonus for athletes who graduate within five years. We should allow athletes who are recruited by a head coach who leaves the institution prior to that athlete's initial enrollment the opportunity to be released from the National Letter of Intent and transfer without penalty. It sounds great to say that the athlete should select an institution, but we all know that is not the case, that that head coach is very influential in that young person's decision.

While we are at it, let's eliminate athletics dormitories and the constant isolation of the athlete from the rest of the student body. (Applause) Any new model must make the athlete as indistinguishable as possible from the rest of the student body.

You may not agree with these thoughts, and there are certainly many other thoughts and ideas for a new model. These are suggestions to stimulate your thoughts and to stimulate your actions. We need to be aggressive and proactive in changing our model, because there are others, less qualified, waiting in the wings to do it for us. The expertise is here in this room to do this quickly and efficiently. Athletics directors and coaches should lead the way in designing new program changes. The faculty representatives need to guarantee academic integrity. The chief executive officers have to direct, support and improve the entire concept.

I ask that you be prepared at the 1991 Convention to introduce and pass legislation that will create major reform in intercollegiate athletics. I personally intend to pursue these ideas as well as simplification of the legislative process with you as well as the Presidents Commission and the Council. In too many cases, power coaches, alumni and boosters are dictating athletics policy. In all those cases, violations, probation and embarrassment usually follows. Athletics has to be a coordinated segment of the educational process. Universities have to be in control of their athletics programs. You have a unique and stimulating opportunity. Developing a new model is a serious, challenging effort. It is going to take courage. It is an enormous challenge, but it is one that you have to accept. Thank you. (Applause)

President Witte: We have concluded the business portion of this

session, and I now would like to turn this over to the freshman eligibility debate.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.]

Presidential Debate: Freshman Eligibility

Sunday Afternoon, January 7, 1990

Martin A. Massengale (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): We are here today to talk about a very important topic. I would like to welcome all of you on behalf of the Presidents Commission and express our appreciation to you for so many being interested in this debate. I hope that most of you will stay because it is an important topic, one that we should discuss adequately, as Dick Schultz indicated earlier this evening, during the next year. I will serve as moderator of this part of the program.

I am sure many of you in this room are aware of the fact that the Presidents Commission has discussed the issue of freshman eligibility since the Commission was formed some six years ago. The Commission has surveyed presidents and chancellors on two different occasions about the subject; and in our April meeting this past year, it became obvious in the division subcommittee sessions that there was increasing interest in revisiting this topic.

I think most of you know that there is not unanimity. So, it is the Commission's decision that we should stage this discussion this afternoon. We hope that it will stimulate your thinking and that you, as a member of the NCAA, will address the topic in your various meetings during the year and we in turn will do likewise.

This afternoon, our debaters are two distinguished members of the Presidents Commission, two distinguished CEOs at their respective institutions. One will speak in favor of declaring freshman ineligibility, and the other will argue for maintaining freshman eligibility, essentially what we have at the present time. Now, after each individual has presented his comments, we will give them an opportunity to respond to the other; and then if we have remaining time, and I hope that we do, we will give you a chance to ask questions and to entertain comments that you may wish to ask during that discussion.

The first presenter this afternoon, speaking for freshman ineligibility, will be Chancellor Charles Young of the University of California, Los Angeles, long time interested in athletics. It is a pleasure for me to present to you at this time Chancellor Young. (Applause)

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): Thank you very much, Martin. I would like to say, first of all, that while this is advertised as a debate, I certainly don't think of it as a debate. I know that Tom does not either.

I have no objections to debating; I would rather enjoy it, but I think we are here today to try to shed some light on a very important problem. The subject of the eligibility or ineligibility of first-year students to participate in intercollegiate athletics is again an issue of debate and not, at this time, of action at an NCAA Convention.

I say again, because this obviously is not the first time that it has been before this august body, indeed, it is interesting to note that the history of the debate over the issue of freshman eligibility is longer than the history of the NCAA itself. While the NCAA is celebrating its 85th anniversary, the issue of freshman eligibility or ineligibility (as we know from the research on this topic done by Ron Smith and Jay Hellman) is now serving its second century, dating from a proposal in 1989 from then Harvard University President Charles Elliott, to have all first-year students declared ineligible for intercollegiate competition to protect against what he considered, mind you over 100 years ago, the questionable recruiting practices of the universities and colleges of that era in bringing marginally qualified students to their institutions to represent them on the playing field or court.

While I am a political scientist by discipline, the historian in me could not help but be intrigued by the comprehensive historical report that I have just referred to, which was compiled in 1987, as I have indicated, by Ronald Smith and Jay Hellman of Pennsylvania State on this century-old issue.

Major conference affiliations, we learn from that report, have been formed as a result of colleges and universities bonding together to develop a common standard with regard to freshman eligibility. Major intraconference disputes developed that lasted for a number of years, including one that started 75 years ago and required five years to resolve between two of UCLA's sister Pac-10 universities, Stanford and the University of California, Berkeley.

From reading this report and other material, I come to the conclusion that while most of the restrictions placed on the recruitment, the provisions of financial aid and eligibility of student-athletes throughout the history of intercollegiate athletics, appear to have been stimulated by the concern for athletics equity (the so-called level-playing-field issue); arguments for ineligibility of the freshman seem to have come more out of concern for the necessity to minimize the pressure of athletics participation on the academic pursuits of student-athletes and (as a correlate of that goal) to protect the academic integrity of the colleges and universities involved. This certainly was the rationale for the proposal made by Harvard's Elliott and has been echoed throughout the subsequent 10 decades.

On the other hand, my reading of the history of the debates and comments associated with proposals for the relaxation of or the elimination of freshman ineligibility, exposes a focus on the need to accommodate special circumstances (such as the depletion of male undergraduates created by World War II or the Korean Conflict) or cost-containment and cost-reduction measures that would result

from the elimination of separate freshman teams or competition (such as were instrumental in the legislation to permit a return to freshman eligibility passed at the 1968 and 1972 NCAA Conventions).

Despite these historical characterizations, which I believe are accurate, it is reasonable for those who oppose the change, the status quo, are open on that particular subject to ask why such a change is needed. The apparent lack of research, which demonstrates that a nonparticipating freshman athlete can do better academically than participating freshmen, understandably is cited as supporting the status quo, or at least undercutting the argument for change. I believe that the evidence is clear that while most of our students have a difficult time making the transition academically and socially from high school to the highly competitive environment that prevails at most of our colleges and universities, those who come in at the lower end of the spectrum of academic preparation (as unfortunately is the case with regard to many of the student-athletes at our universities) find that transition especially difficult.

To compound that problem, we then placed added burdens on many of these same students by placing them in the pressure cooker of athletics competition during their first year at our university. One of the things we have learned, I think, from the AIR data, one of the clearest things we have learned, is with regard to the problems identified by the student-athletes themselves, who make it clear, as our director has just indicated, that they believe their primary problem is that the rigors and other circumstances of athletics competition make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to lead lives similar to those of "regular" students.

I believe the ability to get started in their university careers with less pressure placed upon them to be "irregular" certainly would help with regard to that problem.

Even if a proponent of freshman eligibility is able to convince his colleagues that there are sound academic reasons for change, the argument is always far from over. I have found that one of the major problems which I confront in this regard is that each person making an opposing argument against freshman ineligibility sets up his own straw-man version of the ineligibility rule.

Therefore, I propose to set forth at this point the skeleton of a rule I believe would meet the academic integrity test and at the same time be workable. The basic thrust of such a rule would be to declare all first-year students ineligible for intercollegiate competition. I believe this should be none in all sports, but I believe that an argument could be made for a distinction between team and nonteam sports on the grounds that while often very heavy in the individual sports, the pressures are of a different character. Some types of individual competition may be both necessary and proper. I emphasize the word competition since I would propose that such students as have met the requirements of Proposition 48 be allowed to participate in a limited way in practices to allow them to learn, to maintain and improve their skills and physical condition.

But on the days of competition, such students would not be allowed to be a member of the varsity team, not part of the travel party of the team and so forth. Those students, who did not meet the Proposition 48 requirements, would continue to be ineligible for practice or for financial aid during the freshman year.

The second basic element of such a rule change would be to allow those first-year students who have met the qualification standards of Proposition 48, four years of eligibility for NCAA competition in the ensuing four-year period, while those students who did not meet that standard would be eligible for only three of the ensuing four years. All other provisions of Proposition No. 48 would remain the same, including the awarding of financial aid.

Further, I believe that there is no reason for any change in the maximum number of grants that would be made available as a result of declaring freshmen ineligible. While I would not be prepared at this time to support a specific implementation proposal, I would support in principle the provision that is part of the proposal of the Committee on Basketball Issues make the fourth year of eligibility contingent upon progress to a degree sufficient to make it clear that graduation is highly probable.

This outline of a rule that I have sketched is not a complete return to the pre-1968-1972 arrangements. Prior to that time, a student-athlete retained only three years of eligibility in the ensuing four years after the initial year of ineligibility. This proposal will allow four years of eligibility. This change takes account of the fact that for most, except for the best prepared and career focused of our students, something approaching a five-year program has now become the rule. It also takes account of the realities of Proposition 48, in that it reserves a meaningful distinction between those who meet that test and those who do not.

Some might describe the proposal as a so-called "mandatory redshirt year." But it is more than that in my opinion. As a redshirt, a first-year student is able to be a member of the team's traveling group, to suit up for the game; and consequently be ready, if needed, to play in the contest. This in turn leads to a full schedule of game preparations each year in addition to the team practice sessions. I am told by some of our most successful coaches that this leads to a much more intense and pressurized experience than would be the case if these students were not eligible to participate.

I am fully aware that there are those who do not believe that a change in the current freshman eligibility rule is necessary. As I said earlier, some will argue that there is no statistical evidence to demonstrate that there is any significant disadvantage in the academic performance of first-year student-athletes under the current rule. Others, even if they agree that there are academic reasons for change, will suggest that a rule such as the one I have proposed will result in additional financial aid costs due to the increased number of five-year grants at a time when economic pressures are affecting all of us, an argument which I believe is unfounded.

Others will suggest that certain regions of the country will have more of an opportunity than others to replenish their varsity teams with junior college transfers and first-year junior athletes that are eligible for competition. A corollary to that (I also have heard argued) is that certain talented student-athletes will not enroll in the four-year institutions but instead will enroll at a local community college in order to retain the edge of actual competition and then transfer to a four-year institution.

Another group will suggest that the same prohibition of competition should extend to other activities, such as the debate team, the glee club or the varsity band that marches on the football field at half time. Finally, others will argue that such a rule would unduly penalize those talented first-year student-athletes who do meet the qualification standards of Proposition 48 and that, further, the rule would motivate students to require five years to complete their undergraduate study rather than encourage them to finish their required degree courses in four years.

I have heard these arguments and criticisms before, and there is some merit to them, although I believe that I can answer them. I can answer them certainly to my own satisfaction.

Now, I must simply state that I do not consider these points individually or collectively to carry sufficient weight as to overcome the general concern that I have with regards to the actual circumstances of recruitment practices, including the promises of immediate first-year competition for those with inadequate high school preparation for university academic work, or the irrefutable time pressures placed on the young students' daily lives from extensive preparation for and participation in athletics competition. Further, it is an issue on which former student-athletes have strong views as well. I took special note this past May when the six former college football student-athletes inducted into the Academic All-America Hall of Fame, each of whom had achieved a 3.200 grade-point average in their undergraduate work, suggested that first-year students be declared ineligible for varsity sports so these students can better adjust to college life.

I am not suggesting that the elimination of freshman eligibility is the end-all solution. There are many other issues regarding academic integrity and participation in intercollegiate athletics that will come and should receive attention. We must, as Dick Schultz has indicated, reduce the pressure on all our athletes, not just freshmen. We must reform the recruiting process and undertake cost-cutting measures. Fortunately, some substantial changes in several of these areas are on the agenda for action at this Convention, and I hope more will be before us next year. But we must venture forth on several fronts at once if we are to restore intercollegiate athletics to its proper and respected place in American higher education. One of the changes that is necessary is to enable those student-athletes we recruit and admit to our universities to get a fair start in the race for their education.

I hope that today's discussion and proposal to eliminate freshman eligibility will receive active consideration during the coming year by the Presidents Commission and others and be returned at least in some form to the Convention a year from now for consideration and adoption by the membership. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Massengale: Thank you very much, Chuck, for that very fine presentation. Now, to present the side of the issue on freshmen remaining eligible is Thomas Hearn, president of Wake Forest University.

Thomas K. Hearn (Wake Forest University): Thank you, Martin. It will be obvious that I have not seen Chuck's remarks, when I wrote these, so he will be returning to some of the intramural differences in the discussion session which follows.

I remain perplexed as to why this issue has become the symbol of academic reform in college athletics. It is essential to separate symbols and substance. Given the goals that prevail, freshman ineligibility is no panacea. Were freshmen to become ineligible, our athletics houses would not be put in order; certainly some of our present problems would be made worse.

Everything I will say follows from a principle of academic priority. That principle states that all the changes which must be achieved to enhance the educational experiences of student-athletes must come at the expense of their involvement in athletics. That is a serious principle, we have often violated it, deriving from the very nature of the university. We now know empirically from the AIR studies how intrusive these athletics involvements are, and there are proposals before this Convention to begin to assert this principle into our own working lives.

Now, we pay lip service to this academic-priority principle; and were we to put it to a vote, it would pass this body by a huge majority. But it is not something this body has fostered and protected. In fact, we have acted otherwise. In the 1987 study to which Chancellor Young alluded, the conclusion was: "It has proven difficult to insure that those concerned with intercollegiate athletics have as great a concern for the preservation of academic integrity as they have for promoting an environment for academic equity and for maintaining financial security."

The nation is now demanding that athletics be placed within the educational mission of the university. Above all, we must end the exploitation of young people that occurs when we violate the principle that schools exist for learning, not for playing.

Let me now outline what I will call an "academic" freshman-ineligibility proposal. It is designed specifically to pass the academic-priority tests. Such a principle must have the following characteristics:

All student-athletes should be ineligible to compete as freshmen, not just as is commonly proposed, men's basketball and football players. We know how much time is involved in all sports programs, and there is no academic justification for limiting eligibility to one or two sports. More class time is lost to golf. Baseball plays more games.

More practice hours are demanded in swimming. Only three years of athletics eligibility should remain after the freshman year. Normal academic progress for full-time students envisions a degree in four years, and three years of eligibility is required by the academic-priority principle if freshmen are declared ineligible.

There should be severe restriction on practice for freshman athletes. There can be no freshman teams, no living in athletics dorms, eating or training tables, or serving as a dummy for the coming opponent. Practice in other athletics involvements must be severely restricted if the purpose of this freshman year is to permit student-athletes to be regular students.

There should be a virtual elimination of the practice of redshirting. The principle should be that athletes like other students graduate in four years. Holding students out to make them bigger and stronger and faster does not pass the test.

Now, here is a proposal that clearly passes, it seems to me, the academic-priority test. Is such a proposal desirable? I am not at all convinced. Most of you are aware of the study conducted by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers. It was a thorough, thoughtful study, and it concludes: "None of the evidence arising from the study suggests that participation in freshman athletics in itself has a negative effect on academic performance in the freshman year. This study provides no support for blanket prohibition of freshman participation in college varsity athletics." Professor Slayton of Iowa reported after reviewing all of the studies: "There are simply no academic or sociological data to suggest that freshman athletes need a year to adjust to college life."

The Fac-10 survey reached a similar conclusion and found that the academic performance of redshirt freshman at every institution in the conference was poorer than all freshman athletes. The uniform evidence is that freshman athletes are not harmed academically by their participation. That does not, of course, mean that we should be satisfied with the present levels of performance.

My second concern is cost. A major NCAA effort was reported this afternoon by Commissioner Corrigan, seeking to reduce costs. Most of our programs are financially at great risk, and we must not create new burdens except where there is clear and obvious need. Any proposal for freshman ineligibility, which passes the academic-priority tests, will cost money and lots of it.

Finally, these proposals discriminate against new athletes. We do not prohibit drama students, debaters or student journalists, to name three extremely time-consuming extracurricular programs, from participating as freshman. It is reasonable to expect a legal challenge to any such policy. How do we reasonably prevent athletes but not others from participating in extracurricular programs of the university?

I have now seen an ineligibility proposal of this strict academic sort. What I have seen and what I am going to call "redshirt" proposals, requiring the ineligibility of freshmen in men's basketball

and football only, generally award four years of eligibility upon the conditions of normal progress for the degree. There are obviously many other issues that would need to be clarified about these proposals: practice requirements, freshman teams, redshirting and the like. I oppose these redshirt proposals, and they do not pass the academic-priority tests. So long as four years of athletics eligibility are awarded, whatever the circumstances, there is a clear gain to the athletics program at the expense of the principle of a four-year baccalaureate degree. No football or basketball player with talent would ever graduate in four years. That is for most of us a costly proposal. If freshman ineligibility for football and basketball were introduced without the elimination of redshirting, some students, of course, would be in for six years.

Now, this is the principal thing I want to say: To leave the present athletics demands in place and make freshman ineligible because of those demands is wrong in principle and represents bad policy. Our response to the demands of athletics participation must be to reduce those demands, not to lengthen the student careers.

At this Convention, we are considering modest steps to address the time requirements of football and basketball. Other sports will receive our attention in coming Conventions. The solution to the problem of the excessive time involvements in athletics should affect all student-athletes, all sports, all four years.

Now, the practice of redshirting constitutes a current voluntary freshman-ineligibility program. In a CFA survey taken after the 1986 football season, 44 institutions reported that 721 freshman players were withheld from competition, an average of 16½ a team. Here is Chuck Neinas' conclusion based on that survey.

"It would appear," he said, "that declaring freshmen ineligible in the sport of football would have a minimal impact on those programs that are well established and enjoy many traditions, but would have serious consequences for programs that may not have the luxury of redshirting a large number of players from the freshman class."

Now, I would not call redshirting a luxury, but Mr. Neinas' point is well made. Redshirting places at a competitive disadvantage those schools that maintain educational rather than athletics priorities by awarding their students a normal degree path. Redshirting is an athletics, not an academic, practice; and freshman ineligibility proposes to make this practice mandatory rather than voluntary. But its justification remains precisely the same.

These redshirt proposals for freshman ineligibility (and I understand this is not what Chancellor Young has proposed) are athletics proposals marching in academic regalia. It is clearly in the interest of the athletics team to have 22- and 23-year-old men on the field instead of 18- and 19-year-olds.

But that is not an interest which passes the academic-priority tests. The redshirt proposals, as they are commonly presented, need to march in their own uniforms; and that uniform is sneakers and shoulder pads.

The discussion of freshman ineligibility frequently is devoted to the circumstances of underprepared student-athletes. Our hypocrisy shows here. What underprepared students need and deserve is access, certainly, but access to our classrooms, teachers and special learning opportunities. They do not need access to our playing fields. In our admission of these students for athletics purposes, we exploit them unless we provide these students the education their very special circumstances require. Our athletics concern about access becomes the right to play rather than the need to study.

Given what we now know empirically about the demands of athletics participation, many of these at-risk students should not play varsity sports as undergraduates. They need desperately an education that will provide the basis for their meaningful future.

Now, the implications of freshman ineligibility for Proposition No. 48 generally are disturbing. If all freshman football and men's basketball players, or others, are ineligible, there will be little incentive not to recruit these academic students. There is growing evidence that Proposition 48 is having an impact where it matters the most, in the high schools. This nation has no more urgent priority than the redemption of public education. The NCAA has the opportunity to make a substantial impact on the preparation of high-school students everywhere. If this assembly were to retreat on these efforts to enhance public education by nullifying or rendering ineffective the objectives of Proposition 48, there will be outrage from the public as well as from the nation's political leadership.

Concerned as we are and should be about our underprepared students, let us not forget those good student-athletes whose level of academic performance is being jeopardized by the excessive demands of the athletics program. We should strengthen over time the standards for athletics eligibility. Students who are ill-prepared for college should be held out of play and practice as freshmen, and those that score the threshold should be allowed to compete. If such standards arise, we will see a corresponding rise in the achievement of high-school athletes. That, in turn, will influence high-school performance generally. American education, from the beginning to end, must raise its standard; and the NCAA and all of us must be part of that process.

The underprepared student is a serious concern, but our concern for these students largely has been misplaced. We must be concerned with their academic ability. We should be directing that they study more, play less and not just in the freshman year. When we admit these students and exploit their athletics talents for as long as possible, and permit their education and thereby their future to be compromised, we have violated a sacred responsibility.

An academic freshman-ineligibility proposal—all sports, three years of play—is never going to be considered seriously before this Convention. I know that and you know that. The athletics directors will find it prohibitively expensive, and the coaches would oppose it for reasons too numerous to cite. The redshirt proposals are wrong in

principle. We should reduce the athletics time demands for all student-athletes, rather than accept those time demands as somehow inevitable and necessary. These proposals basically should be taken for what they are, athletics proposals presented in the name of academic reform.

The problems involved in this discussion can and must be solved in our admissions offices. We are admitting marginal students; exhausting them in practice, travel and competition, and placing before them academic demands for which we know they are not qualified.

Freshman ineligibility, my friends, is no solution to that scandalous conduct on our part. As Professor Slayton has put it in an afterphrase: "We have set out to protect student-athletes from our own insanity." Marginal students need academic development lest we fail them.

Our plan should be to provide freshman eligibility as an incentive to better secondary-school performance. It is unfair, unwise, unnecessary and very costly to make into a principle that because some freshman students should not be varsity athletes, no student should. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Massengale: Thank you very much, President Hearn, for your very fine presentation. I think at this time it is appropriate that we give the speakers a chance to respond to the other's comments.

Mr. Young: There are just two or three things I think that I would like to say. First of all, I think that it is very clear that in large measure there is not disagreement between the two of us. Indeed, a good bit of my colleague's talk was taken up with urging things that I would join with him in urging—that we all spend a great deal more time and effort in seeing to it that students in general and student-athletes in particular who are coming to our institutions are provided with the help and assistance that they need to pursue their college educations successfully. I agree with that.

We agree certainly that there ought to be a reduction in the amount of time and pressure placed upon all student-athletes, not merely on freshmen; but I believe that even with a reduction in the time and pressure that is placed upon all members of the football team—eliminating the necessity for them to spend, as I read from the studies, 30 hours per week in football—it would be useful to have freshman spending a little less time than those who have had the opportunity to become acclimated to the program.

Another area where we do disagree but one where I would like to make a comment, is in regard to the four-year academic program. The four-year bachelor's degree in American higher education is a nice thing for us to talk about, but it went out with the previous models of automobiles; perhaps it went out with the predominance of the Detroit-built automobiles in the United States. That is no longer the case. The overwhelming bulk of our students are taking longer than four years to get their education.

Furthermore, there is nothing that would prevent an athlete, a student-athlete who was capable of graduating in four years, from

doing so and then continuing on as a graduate student while pursuing the amount of eligibility remaining. Those students, who are going to pursue the kind of academic program with the rigor that would be required in order for them to graduate in four years, I think, are those students who would, as a matter of fact, like to have some time provided and supported for them to pursue postbaccalaureate work.

With regard to how well students would do under a freshman-ineligibility program, in relation to those who were not in such a program, I don't believe you can cite how redshirt freshmen do in comparison to those who are not redshirted. We are talking about a single system. We are talking about a system in which they are all participating. When one goes back and looks at redshirt freshman, for the most part, that is retrospective; a person who was a redshirt freshman that didn't play. Those people throughout the year, most of them, are participating in practice. They are participating in game preparation. They are dressing in games, and they are going to games just as if they were going to play. Those that are not playing are not, for the most part, as happy as those that are playing. Therefore, the fact that they are being redshirted may have some negative effect on how well they do academically.

Lastly, to the question of cost. At least under the proposal as I have presented it, I don't see any reason why there is any increase in costs. I am not proposing a freshman team or freshman competition program, which would cost additional money. I am not proposing to increase the number of students who can be on grants-in-aid which a number of students who can be on grants-in-aid on any program at any particular point in time.

I fail to see how a move away from freshman eligibility along the lines of the program I have described would increase the cost. I want to emphasize the fact that in what I am proposing, I am not in any way saying that the pressure for continued improvement in what we are doing and in how we treat our students and what we guarantee them when we bring them to our institutions should be diminished.

Mr. Massengale: President Hearn, this is your opportunity to comment on Chancellor Young's remarks.

Mr. Hearn: Let me go back to another way of stating what I think is the general issue here. In the simplest possible terms, the possibility and the desirability of freshman ineligibility will be decided on three criteria—academic, I hope first, but also financial and athletic. I think this is the problem: a proposal for freshman ineligibility that meets the academic test is going to fail the financial and the athletics test. The more of our student-athletes who are on five- or six-year degree paths, the more it costs. I believe that ultimately we are talking here about what one of my trustees likes to call adult money; this is not the weekly allowance.

If we declare freshman ineligible and do not increase grants-in-aid, as Chancellor Young suggests, the coaches, particularly in the nonrevenue sports, are going to riot, ladies and gentlemen. We know

good and well that there will be pressures for increased grants-in-aid. If we restrict not just competition but practice, then those restrictions, it seems to me, must be substantially lifted if we are going to provide, as Chancellor Young has phrased it, an opportunity for students to be regular students. We know full well that the athletics directors and coaches are going to oppose those proposals. So an academically sound proposal is going to flunk the financial and athletics concerns.

Alternatively, if we turn around and make a proposal that satisfies the athletics concerns—what I call the redshirt proposals—then those proposals are at best and at worst destructive of the educational and academic needs of students.

These are not debatable points, because these things—athletics, financial and academics—translate directly into interest groups that are represented in this hall today. To oversimplify this again, the presidents, chancellors, the Presidents Commission and perhaps the faculty athletics representatives are going to reflect and represent the academic interests in this. The athletics directors are going to speak for the financial concern—they must balance their budget—and the coaches are going to speak for the athletics interests.

Now, regarding freshman ineligibility, what is going to satisfy one group of us is going to alienate the rest of us. Therefore, should a proposal come forth dealing with freshman ineligibility, I am deeply afraid that we would confront a politically charged, divisive and, I think, costly proposal that cannot be adopted in any form before this body and that will represent a substantial improvement to students. What we need to be doing is addressing the real—rather than the symbolic—problems that have to do with the time demands being made on students and the characteristics of our admissions process; and about those matters, which many I am quite sure you understand, Chancellor Young and I are in agreement.

Those of us in college athletics have been hypocritical about all of this, of course; and yet I have always preferred hypocrisy to not living up to your principles, to cynicism, having no principles. Hypocrites, to their great credit, sometimes, but not often, practice what they preach. We have a chance to do just that at this Convention when we vote on those proposals to reduce time demands on our student-athletes. (Applause)

Mr. Massengale: Gentlemen, thank you very much for a fine presentation and rebuttal. Seeing no one moving towards the microphone or waving their arms, I want to thank you all for being with us and for giving us your attention.

[The presidential debate was concluded at 6:39 p.m.]

Division I-A Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1990

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by B. J. Skelton, Clemson University, NCAA Division I vice-president.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Skelton: Will everyone please take their seats. There are some announcements that I would like to read to you at this time. Let me call your attention to two portions of your Convention Program. First, see Page vi in the buff-colored pages. There you will find the program for this Division I-A business session. Then in Appendix A, Page 103, the first of the blue pages in the program, you will find a list of the six proposals that we will take action upon this morning. We first will vote on these items, and then we will entertain any discussion of proposals on the agenda for the Division I business session this afternoon. There will not be a great deal of time for discussion in that session. Finally, if we have time remaining, we can review any other proposal in the book that you may wish to discuss.

[NOTE: The procedure for roll-call voting was reviewed.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football

Tom Osborne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I move that we adopt No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like briefly to mention some of the reasons why this has been proposed, and I think there is a tremendous amount of discussion about cost cutting. This would not exceed the total number of 95 in any way. At the University of Nebraska, for instance, over the last four years, we have used 82 scholarships for an average of 20.5 per year. We feel that this proposal allows those schools that are not at the 95 limit an opportunity to catch up.

I think that it is very important that we at least try to achieve balance and give these schools an opportunity. In the present system of 25-95, I think most schools currently have 55, 60, 65 athletes in their programs. They will have a very, very difficult time ever approximating 95. Those schools that are at the 95 limit have a favorable program; and with a fair amount of time, I think, will be able to operate consistently. By giving 20 to 25 scholarships a year, they will have the 95 total. We feel that there is support to have competitive balance in the Division I-A football. It is better for all sports, better for attendance, television and so on. So we certainly urge the adoption of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 34 (Page A-45) was defeated by Division I-A, 26-80, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention, the same piece of legislation was passed and then brought back for a roll-call vote, mainly because the NCAA Infractions Committee felt that in passing it, it might make it difficult to impose some sanctions against certain athletics programs. The committee requested we wait a year and then reintroduce the proposal.

The purpose of this piece of legislation is very simple. It allows an institution to award athletics aid to a student-athlete in the sport of football who has been in residence at the institution for two full years and who has not been granted any athletics aid previously. The aid, when given, would count for the allowable 95 grants in football and would not count against the 25 initial grants for that year. It will not, as some individuals have indicated, allow institutions to stockpile football players. Outstanding players are not going to be on campus two years without a grant. It does allow the coach to reward a young man who has shown improvement and is making a contribution to the team by giving him a grant as he enters his third year.

With the current 25 initial grants, it makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the coach to do this. You still are operating with 95 total grants, and this proposal gives the coach the opportunity to assist the deserving student-athlete who has become an important part of the program in his first two years on campus. There are no hidden agendas or attempts in the proposal, or we as a conference would not sponsor it. I ask for your support of Proposal No. 46.

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): Mr. Chair, I ask your support of this proposal. It gives an opportunity for institutions with low squad numbers, because of unique situations, a chance to be a little more competitive. Certainly, it will not hurt the rich and it may help the poor just a little bit.

Ken Hatfield (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Speaking for a lot of our coaches, this is something we really feel is important for competitive balance. I think that we are all concerned in everything with the student-athlete. I think that every one of us has 12 to 15 guys who are on our team and are making active contributions to our team, and we can't do anything for them. I think this is something that we all feel is equitable and that we can help some of those student-athletes who paid their own way for a couple of years and who are making contributions. I think it is our way of saying "thank you" for the job that they have done. We certainly hope that everybody will pass this.

James Walden (Iowa State University): I would like very much to appeal to all of you in here to listen to a person who feels like this is

totally necessary, because I am a football coach who has gone through three years of never having more than 61 young men on a football field, scholarship-wise, for three consecutive years. For some reason or other we have voted down all issues which would address the issue to take care of that. To me, it is an injustice to the athletes. I think that is the point that is not being made here. We keep making it an adult's problem and it is an athlete's problem when you try to coach a football team with no more than 60 players and a few walk-ons.

The walk-on kids, I would like to say to you, are the basis for everything that we have been able to accomplish in the last three years. I have at least five to six walk-ons who are never going to help me win a Big Eight Conference championship or any other kind of championship, but by the grace of God, if I had not had them, there were at least five ball games in the last three years that I am not sure that I could have performed as well in. I would like to tell all of you that there is not a football coach alive who is going to give a nonscholarship athlete a scholarship that will turn his program. But without this kind of legislation, we have no way of rewarding.

In my case, consider this: If I give five young men scholarships who so vitally need them this year, you are then taking me beyond the 25, which I cannot exceed and I am only going to have 75 next year if I give 25 new scholarships. If I can't add some walk-ons, and I have to take them off, they are not going to help me win any games. But it will allow me a little bit of flexibility to award five guys who richly deserve it and still be able to go out and recruit 25 guys like everybody else is on the open market.

So I, for no other reason than this, beg you to understand that we should have some kind of vehicle to reward young people who will come to our campus and pay their own way—take the licks for two full years—be able to give them some kind of financial aid, especially those of us who are down in numbers.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-55) was approved by Division I-A.]

Resolution: Formal Invitations—Certified Postseason Football Games

John D. Swofford (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): On behalf of the NCAA Special Events Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think we all know that the current legislation regarding the bowl selection dates is not working and vastly needs improvement. This resolution simply asks the Council to put before the 1991 Convention legislation that either has teeth and can be enforced or a proposal that eliminates such legislation altogether so that there is no formal bowl invitation date. The Postseason Football Subcommittee urges your support of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 131 (Page A-119) was approved by Division I-A.]

Postseason Bowl-Game Eligibility—Written Report

John D. Swofford (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I

move the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 72—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under the able leadership of John Swofford, the Postseason Football Subcommittee this year has been dealing with quite a number of the bowl issues and has made, in concert with the bowl association, a lot of progress, in my opinion. One of the things that we wanted to do was to put in the amendment that you see in your Convention Program. We, as a committee, did not include the penalty that is in the book. The NCAA Council added that; and in the opinion of the Pacific-10 Conference it is a mistake to include a penalty of this magnitude for failure to submit a report. Yes, the committee wants the reports from the directors of those institutions fortunate enough to be in bowls, but we do not believe that the penalty should be the loss of a bowl the subsequent year. We recommend that you amend this proposal to remove the penalties. I am certain that the staff can obtain these reports without this type of threat.

[Proposal No. 72—1 (Page A-76) was approved by Division I-A.]

Mr. Swofford: Proposal No. 72 simply institutes a new procedure that would ask the athletics directors at each institution participating in a postseason bowl game to submit a written report to the Postseason Football Subcommittee by February after the game. This report would be on a form, which would be approved by the Council, and would assist the committee in consolidating information about the bowl and in evaluating whether or not that bowl was conducted in compliance with governing NCAA legislation.

[Proposal No. 72 (Page A-75) was approved by Division I-A as amended by No. 72—1.]

Conditioning Programs

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of No. 90 is stated in the intent. However, as it got written into the legislative procedures, the intent and the proposals are not quite the same. So, let me explain what we are trying to do here. The intent here is to make it possible for the weight coach and athletics director, who has department-wide responsibilities, to supervise the off-season conditioning program. The interpretation that has come down lately from the Council is that, for instance, the weight coach can supervise a program so long as it is in the weight room, but not any other type of conditioning facility or outdoor facility. As a result, we have all types of facades of classes created in order to have off-season weight conditioning programs.

The intent of this piece of legislation, as it stands now, is to pass it as it is and then to request once again, and hopefully with support of Division I-A members on the Council, the correct interpretation so

that these people would supervise the conditioning program once and for all, so that we get everybody on the same page and don't have people creating false classes and creating all kinds of smoke screens in order to have an off-season conditioning program. If we don't want an off-season conditioning program, then let's vote the off-season program out. But let's put it on the same page. Support No. 90, get the proper interpretation and then everybody will be on the same page. That is the intent of this piece of legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-89) was approved by Division I-A.]

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 8:35 a.m..]

Division I-AA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1990

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 8:10 a.m., with Charlotte West, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, presiding.

Ms. West: Good morning. My name is Charlotte West. I am the associate athletics director at Southern Illinois University, and I am one of six members on the NCAA Council who represent you as Division I-AA members of the Association. We do our very best to represent you well among those 44 members.

[NOTE: Division I-AA members of the NCAA Council were introduced, announcements were made, Convention publications were reviewed and the voting procedure was explained.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley College Conference): I move to adopt Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

Benny Hollis (Northeast Louisiana University): Fellow delegates, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 44. It has been my pleasure during the last four years to serve as a member of the Division I-AA Football Committee. I feel that I have had an opportunity to visit with the I-AA schools across the country concerning their programs, and I believe that this is a proposal that will do harm to the quality of play in I-AA football. First of all, I think it is unwise to cut scholarships. As you remember, we already have gone through this with many schools in 1981 when we had a change in Division I and I-AA was doubled in size overnight. Many schools that had 95 scholarships immediately were cut to 75. Then we cut to 70. I think that when we cut scholarships, we deprive hundreds of youngsters the opportunity for financial aid.

There is an exciting brand of football that is played in I-AA. Many of us would like to play a couple of I-A games to have the opportunity to make a little money there occasionally. And we feel that it is important not to widen this gap from 95 any further to 60 or 65 even. We feel that anything less than 70 certainly weakens I-AA football. We have talked a great deal with the different commissioners in Division I-AA football; many of them feel the same way. You know, you don't have to award the 70 grants; but once we place this cap, we are going to make it very difficult to get it back up. And I think that we need stability as we continue to develop the championships in I-AA football. Over the past four years, we have seen a marked

increase in the amount of money that the champions of the finest in I-AA receive, and even the participants in the I-AA championship, and it even is going to get better with the CBS package coming on with the 1990 championship.

So, folks, I am just encouraging you to defeat this proposal. I do not think that it does any good for I-AA football and it will weaken the division. It will cause some mutiny among the ranks, and I just think that we would be a lot better off if we leave it at 70. Thank you.

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): Appalachian State University is a I-AA football school, and I rise to encourage you to oppose Proposal 44, which would cut the maximum number of scholarships that can be granted at a I-AA school. I have been in athletics for 15 years. I have seen our school as a I-A school when the chancellor was authorized and expected to build our program to the I-A level. When I-AA was formed years ago, the scholarship level was placed at 80 and subsequently went to 75 and 70. Now, 44 proposes to go to 60. I suppose that in military terms the public relations people in the Pentagon would call that a retrograde movement, but out here in the trenches it looks like a retreat. I do not think it is in the right order. I agree with my colleague.

I oppose the legislative limitation for some very practical reasons. Appalachian, like other I-AA schools, is not rich. We have to lobby for our public money, and we have to compete with other agencies in the private sector for folks from the private sector in academics as well as in athletics. The president or chancellor should not be allowed to dunk and weave behind some unchallenging cap and say that I cannot achieve excellence because I have only so much scholarship money I can spend anyway. I think that the university by nature is a talent-seeking entity, not just in athletics; art, for instance, drama and music—even in the undergraduate level—there is keen competition for virtuoso talent. And at the graduate level, scholarship competition is intense.

Scholarships are a resource. What we really are interested in in athletics is maintaining very high standards. We tell our athletics directors and our coaches who recruit student-athletes, to monitor their academic progress, to be accountable for their graduation and at the same time to maintain a competitive athletics program. Proposal 44 says that by the way, we are going to cut your resources 14 percent. Now, that is not consistent with the way we administer other scholarship talent searches on our campuses, and it is not realistic. I urge you to strongly oppose the mandatory downgrade.

Dorothy E. Hicks (Marshall University): I also would like to emphasize opposition to this. We don't want to cut scholarships. We need to look at other areas in our program that we need to cut rather than depriving many of our student-athletes the chance for financial aid and a college education.

I will not repeat all of the things that President Thomas and the other speakers spoke to. The Division I-AA commissioners have met and have been talking about a national I-AA TV package. It is good

and appealing as it is today; it will not be if we continue to water down scholarships from 70 to 60. It also was pointed out that no school is forced to give 70 scholarships or grants. If we want to give less, we can; but we don't want you to penalize those of us that would like to maintain the caliber of program we have at the present time.

There is another option for those who do not want to consider giving the 70 grants. They maybe need to look at the option of going to Division II. Those of us who don't want to step lower in numbers, want things held to the present level. We really do not want any more nor we do not want any less. So, I would like to encourage you to vote against 44.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Madam Chair, I would like to take a position in support of that of my colleague, John Thomas at Appalachian State, for another reason. The legislation as I see it if passed will ultimately result in the promulgation of the disqualification between Divisions I-A and I-AA. And I think the insidiousness of that reality is something we must not overlook, particularly in view of the fact we still are debating the issues concerning how we slice the pie with regard to the \$1 billion television package. So, I would urge in the strongest terms possible that we do everything necessary to prevent this promulgation of disqualification by voting no as far as Proposition 44 is concerned.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): In Division I-AA, I would note, we all understand the difficulty of insufficient financial resources. All of us are a long way from having the resources of a I-A program. Yet, many of us help our financial situation considerably by playing a game each year against I-A schools. For us, this is a significant source of revenue that far offsets the cost of 10 awards. Therefore, I strongly urge you not to cripple our ability to compete against I-A schools by this proposed reduction of awards that we may give. I also would emphasize that reducing the number of scholarships in I-AA unavoidably will lower the level of competition in I-AA football. I would ask each of you whether you really want that? For those of you who do not see the need to keep yourselves reasonably competitive against I-A schools, there is an alternative means of treating your financial problem. Nothing prevents a conference from setting its own award limitations below the NCAA I-AA level. If a conference such as, for example, the Ohio Valley Conference feels that it needs to lower awards limits because of its financial restraints, let the lowering be done at conference level rather than doing it throughout I-AA, thereby forcing all to diminish their ability to compete effectively against I-A schools.

The proposal from the Ohio Valley Conference may be a solution to its financial problem. For many I-AA schools, however, this proposal will make financial matters even worse by making them less attractive to potential I-AA opponents that certainly are not going to schedule a home game against teams that they are likely to blow off the field. I strongly urge you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-54) was defeated by Division I-AA.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-55) was approved by Division I-AA, 47-41.]

Full-Time Assistant Coaches—Division I-AA Football

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley Conference): I move that we adopt Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

Dorothy E. Hicks (Marshall University): As for speaking in opposition to 75, the sixth coach doubles as a coach, an academic advisor and assisting us for sports and so forth in many of the I-AA programs. They are usually the lowest paid on the football staff anyway. Football staffs cannot be as well-coached and prepared with fewer coaches. The product is less marketable and successful. So I encourage you to vote against Proposal 75.

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): I rise in opposition to Proposal 75. I would hope that we don't further cut back the staffs in football. We ask our coaches to do quite a bit. We ask them to compete against I-A schools in recruiting and on the field, and they are competing against a much larger staff as it is now. Our basketball coaching staffs have five coaches for 15 players. All of our football staffs know that. We have 12 coaches for usually anywhere from 80 to 120 student-athletes in football. Football is our most visible program. It is the area where we have to give more attention as far as academics and everything else in our programs are concerned. And we are asking a very small number of coaches to do all this, many of whom are very young and underpaid as we stated before. I think it is critical that we allow as many full-time coaches as possible in I-AA. And I would urge you to defeat this proposal.

Alan Hauser (Appalachian State University): We unfortunately have just reduced our scholarships from 70 to 65. I would remind all of you that that means we are going to have to be even more careful and even more cautious and even more accurate in our recruiting. That being the case, do we really want to cut another coach. We are asking fewer people, as we do so, to do a far better job in recruiting. I don't think that is wise. I think that if we are going to cut scholarships, we are going to have to keep the number of coaches at the same level.

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): I speak against this proposal. On most of our campuses, our football players make up 20 percent or in excess of 20 percent of our student-athletes. Our football coaches don't make up 20 percent of my coaching staff. I feel that to reduce the coaching staffs further will reduce the educational value of football and will hamper severely the football programs on all our campuses.

[Proposal No. 75 (Page A-78) was defeated by Division I-AA.]

Heritage Bowl

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): Madam Chair, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to make a few comments regarding this particular proposal. Of course, as all of you know, many of our schools are facing financial problems. We have created a special committee on cost reduction. One of the purposes of the proposal to play this game is to bring much needed revenue for the schools involved in the two conferences. This is an opportunity for these schools to distribute the revenue from such a game to the individual programs.

Also, I anticipate maybe some of the questions that you might have on your mind. I recognize that this will lengthen the season for the two teams that are involved. This is no different from the bowl games that are played in Division I-A. I will make it clear that the teams will be available to participate in the I-AA play-off. This possibly could mean only one more game than the two finals in I-AA. Of course, it could only mean possibly 12 or 13 games. I want to point that out. There is ample precedent for this type of legislation. We have the basketball and football classics. We have the Hall of Fame Game; and, of course, just last year the Convention passed legislation for another game. The purpose of that game was to raise much needed revenue for a coaches retirement fund. I guess what we are asking is the same opportunity that some of the I-A schools have. They have an opportunity to participate in the bowl games where they could make up to \$3, \$4 or \$5 million. For those reasons, I would urge that you support this legislation.

Kenneth A. Free (Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): I would like to solicit your support for this proposition. Of course, we want your support basically as Jim has mentioned. One of the things to getting this done is to get legislation in place to allow this to happen. Keep in mind that there may come a time when some of the other Division I-AA conferences may be invited to participate in a bowl and this will be in place in order to allow them to do that. So we ask for your support.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-89) was defeated by Division I-AA.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

General

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Madam Chair, I would like to ask Frank Bonner, my old friend and colleague, to give us some assurance up there on a clarification with regard to Proposal No. 69. There are some idiosyncracies and peculiarities that are related specifically to this legislation that trouble me and some of my colleagues in the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and elsewhere, including, I think, the Ivy League. I would like to solicit the Ivy League's support regarding my inquiry in this regard.

Let me draw for you a scenario, Frank. Now, the Men's Division I Basketball Committee a year ago made the decision to limit the

number of automatic berths. And then as months transpired, the decision was made to rearrange the turf by suggesting that there would be 30 slots available with 32 finalists competing for those 30 slots. Now, as time passed, it became apparent that some kind of a compromise, if you will, could be initiated for purposes of satiating the concerns of the historically black campuses in Division I-AA and elsewhere. As a result, the committee came up with sort of a "quasi-Mickey Mouse" suggestion that there be a play-off system that would involve the bottom-four campuses to vie for what ultimately would be those final 30 slots.

What you now have as a result of that bit of fun and games is the elimination of Section A of No. 69 and then the very clever attempt to put us in a boxed canyon of being forced to vote yes on Part B, which has been sweetened with the use of revenue for those who participate in this so-called play-off, even if they lose, therefore giving them something for their efforts. Now, my contention is that that round is insufficient because it basically allows the men's basketball committee's original position to prevail. That position being one wherein you eliminate the historical happenstance associated with the automatic berth for the kids and their teams that win the league title or that win the league tournament.

I guess my concern, frankly, is one of why after all these years are we going to allow the men's basketball position as ratified and as legitimized by the Executive Committee of the NCAA to get away with this ruse, really, by purposes of giving us: (a) the elimination of Section A in No. 69, and (b) the passage supposedly of Section B. Once we vote for Section B, in effect what we have done is to accept the inevitability of victory on the part of the men's basketball committee relative to its original scheme, which is to get rid of automatic berths and to supplant the automatic berth with a forced squeeze down to 30 slots and then a Mickey Mouse play-off to get to those 30 slots. I think that that is morally wrong; and I think that, frankly, it is not defensible in relationship to all of the closing of ranks that Dick Schultz has attempted to bring about magnificently.

So I am urging that you clarify Part B and that you not allow the men's basketball position to prevail as pertains to the legitimizing of that position by the Executive Committee of the NCAA. Again, what you have done is to put us in a boxed canyon by forcing us to support B; because if we don't support B, then we end up with nothing. And I am urging that my colleague and friend, the commissioner of the Ivy League, support me on that position.

The question is, Frank, am I correct in my assessment with regard to what I think ultimately has occurred relative to the elimination of Section A, and the forced vote on Section B, which then gives the NCAA's Division I Basketball Committee the victory anyway?

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I have a ruling from the parliamentarian, Allen Chapman, that might be helpful. My group is a cosponsor of No. 69. We sponsored 69—if I could respond for just a minute to the questions about why it was

sponsored — because we and many other I-AA and I-AAA conferences felt that without 69 there would be no opportunity, once there were more conferences than 30, for the champions of all the conferences to have any opportunity to qualify for the tournament. I would be glad, after explaining in a minute the parliamentary matter to debate that issue with my old colleague from North Carolina, Chancellor Fort. As a parliamentary matter, the Executive Committee action that created the play-off by accepting the basketball committee's recommendation, moots Proposition 69-A. At least, that is the ruling we have received from Alan J. Chapman who is the parliamentarian for our Association. And so, in the Division I business session, the sponsors of Proposition 69 will withdraw Proposition 69-A.

On the other hand, the action of the Executive Committee leaves unanswered one very specific question. That is whether the play-off games will be no-count contests just as the NCAA championships and conference play-off games are no-count contests. And the parliamentarian has ruled: (a) that that requires a bylaw amendment rather than a resolution; (b) that No. 69-B, which is only that bylaw, can be severed from the rest of 69-A, and (c) the Legislation and Interpretations Committee has ruled that no matter what happens with Proposition 30 and all the counts and no-counts in Proposition 30, that proposal will remain in order. So, the bottom line is that we will introduce Proposition 69-B only in the Division I business session, so that the play-off games that have been created by the Executive Committee, if they take place, will be no-count contests.

On the merits of the proposal, I simply would note that this has been a matter of public debate for two years. There have been numerous public forums and public discussions by many parties. Any conference, institution or individual that wanted to sponsor different legislation has had ample opportunity to do it. Our view, and those are the three conferences that cosponsored this with us, was that this was the proposal that had the best chance of succeeding and of altering the basketball committee's initial position. The basketball committee and the Executive Committee considered this at length over many years. We think they gave us a fair hearing; and, of course, we are pleased that the final action was a change in their view and adoption of our view as put forth in the proposed legislation.

We do not consider it Mickey Mouse, and we don't consider it a boxed canyon. We simply would say that any institution that wanted to seek a separate result had the opportunity to submit legislation and that no other legislation was submitted. I hope that answers the parliamentary inquiry. I would be glad to respond to any questions on that. If there are further debate on the merits of 69, I would be glad to respond to that.

Mr. Fort: Just one comment in response to the comments made by my distinguished colleague and friend, and that being this: I do not dispute, Jeff, what you have defined as the reality of Section B of 69, but this does not negate the fact that ultimately 69 provides the Men's Division I Basketball Committee and, therefore, the Executive

Committee of NCAA with what they sought all along — the elimination of the automatic berth. Try as try can, that remains as a fact. If the kid and his colleagues win the league title or the tournament, they still have to go through another hoop before they can move ahead onto the road to the Final Four.

Mr. Orleans: All I would say is that with that 31st conference next year, league champions rather than going through a hoop would simply go home because there would not be a bid for them. There will be only 30 bids next year. Anymore than that, absent legislation which no one else introduced, would be to increase the number of bids.

Mr. Fort: Well, Jeff, you are right. I cannot deny that, and that is frankly the reason why we probably will be forced to support B. I just want to go on record again, Frank and Madam Chair, indicating that I think the actions taken are less than honest by virtue of the fact that it provides a sidebar measure wherein the prevailing position of the men's basketball committee has been allowed to be obtained. End of comment.

Presidents Commission Grouping

John T. Casteen III (University of Connecticut): Madam Chair, I would like to seek some expression of opinion concerning Proposal No. 28, which I intend to move in the later business session. No. 28 will have the effect of deferring until August 1, 1991, certain provisions contained in Proposal 42 passed in the last NCAA Convention. I have three reasons for supporting this resolution. The first one is that delaying implementation of No. 42 until the proposed date will allow for the completion of institutional research on one complete class admitted under Proposition 48, and thereby will give sufficient information for us to assess the academic effectiveness of Proposition 48.

The second reason is related to some of my own experience regarding standardized testing. I am the immediate past chairman of the College Entrance Examination Board, and I also served for several years as the chairman of the Council on Entrance Services of that board, which is responsible for developing and administering the SAT and also assessing its validity as an instrument to predict academic performance. One reality about the SAT and the ACT and similar instruments is that before they can be used for selection purposes, they must be validated as to their predictive capacity. A standard mechanism for validating such instruments is the regression analysis that is done by virtually all reputable colleges and universities on a recurring basis to verify that the entry criteria used have a reasonable relevance to academic performance in actual programs.

No such validation ever was performed with regard to the "cut" scores that are built into Proposition 48 and carried forward in Proposition 42. That is a problem for a number of reasons. The fundamental reason is that cut scores are prohibited by all standards of good practice that apply to a standardized test; and I was, as the chairman of the Council on Entrance Services, the author of the

original prohibition on such use of scores. The fundamental reason for the prohibition is this: There is a phenomenon in testing called restriction of range. The narrower the range of scores represented in a given population, the less effective any given instrument is in predicting performance within that population, which is to say that if all of one's test scores rested between say 1,300 and 1,400, the score will tell you less about the performance of any individual student than might be the case if your test scores were restricted from, say, 400 to 1,400. That phenomenon alone raises fundamental questions about the validity of the use of SAT scores and ACT scores in both 48 and 42.

There is in addition, a third reason for concern, and that is that the NCAA through Dick Schultz' leadership; the College Board through action of Donald Stewart, the president of the Board; ATS through action of Greg Hambrick, the president of ATS, and ACT are engaged now in studies designed to develop a stability in the combined use of SAT scores and other academic information in determining the eligibility of students to play intercollegiate athletics. Those studies ought to be complete in time for reconsideration, if necessary, in 1991, if it turns out that the present use of the scores is seriously detrimental from an educational point of view. It seems to me that it is fundamentally irresponsible to move from 48 to 42 in light of these realities and I would like to ask for some expression of opinion on these matters. Thank you.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I don't mean to dominate this, but these items are ones that I have some very strong opinions about. I am prepared to support my colleague with regard to No. 28 if, in fact, the preferred ordering defined by the chair prevails in relationship to the vote tomorrow. On the other hand, if that is not to occur, then I strongly would urge instead that the backstop for 28 is 27. The two are absolutely related; and frankly, if we can get support with regard to 27, then that, of course, renders No. 28 moot.

I think that with regard, therefore, to the validity of necessary support for 27, it becomes apparent that the need for same is at least six-fold: No. 1, because 42 as originally conceived is morally bankrupt; No. 2, it's constitutionally questionable; No. 3, it singles out a specific class of students for special, "negative treatment"; No. 4, it fails to answer the basic question about how 42 helps students and really penalizes the victim; No. 5, it is not an attack on 48, and No. 6, the original vote on 42 a year ago was no, and then it was publicly changed and rearranged overnight. So, given all that, I will support No. 28, but only if that becomes necessary as a result of the failure on the part of a large enough group to go along with a defeat of No. 27 with regard to those that would be against it. In other words, a yes vote on 27 will obviate the need for 28; but if, in fact, 27 fails, then by all means, I would urge very strongly that we support the position taken by my colleague who spoke earlier.

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I would just

like to make one comment. I will be speaking in support of No. 27, but we just heard that we should vote for 28 for a number of reasons and primarily to give the NCAA and the other entities an opportunity to study 48 and to wait until the complete study is complete. But I give the same reason and I think more of a compelling reason for voting for 27.

If you recall, the partial qualifier was incorporated as a part of 48 because of the concerns and questions about using the test scores to determine the admission of students to college. And, of course, I don't know why we even had 42 last year; but I would just make the point that if you are saying vote for 28 in order to give us more time to complete the study and so forth, that is more the reason to vote for 27 because the partial qualifier part of 48 was put in in order to keep the door of opportunity open for those students who did not meet all the requirements of 48.

[NOTE: A straw vote indicated that the vote on Proposal No. 27 would be close and that No. 28 would pass if No. 27 failed.]

Financial Aid

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Just to clarify the record. I would like to ask a sponsor of No. 45—looking at the effective date—to explain fully the intention of the application for the 1990-91 academic year in light of the recruiting that is presently in process.

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): I was instructed by a group of presidents who wanted to sponsor this that that was the effective date. I don't think it was clearly thought through, and I agree with Mr. Yeager. I think that what it means in passing is that you just sign fewer players this year, as ridiculous as that is.

Mr. Yeager: On behalf of the Legislation and Interpretation Committee, I guess our interpretation would be that the football coaches now will sign five fewer players than they had a half hour ago for the next year.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Todd Turner (University of Connecticut): I would like to draw this group's attention to Amendments Nos. 24—2 and 24—4, which were handed out to the group this morning. We are in support of these amendments as proposed by Georgetown University, and I have been asked by Georgetown to mention to this body that the intent is simply to protect the identity of the students who we are asking for this information and also to eliminate the racial identification of certain reported scores and certain other academic information. So I ask your support of that.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 9:10 a.m..]

Division I-AAA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1990

The Division I-AAA business session was convened at 9 a.m. by Kathleen M. McNally, La Salle University, chair.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Chair McNally announced the proposals to be voted on at the afternoon Division I business session, those that would be withdrawn and those that had amendments to the amendment. She indicated that the delegates were free to discuss any of the proposals.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Presidents Commission Grouping

A delegate expressed concern with portions of Proposal No. 24, which would require Divisions I and II member institutions to provide admissions and graduation-rate data to prospects, the parents of prospects, and prospects' high school and two-year college coaches. The concern was that the requirement to submit admissions data might provide the opportunity to identify individual student-athletes. There also was concern about reporting the information by race.

Straw votes were taken on Proposal Nos. 26, 27 and 28. The votes were taken on the three as they had been reordered in the opening business session—No. 27 followed by consideration of No. 28 and then No. 26. The vote indicated that Division I-AAA would not favor Nos. 27 or 28 but would favor No. 26. It was noted that No. 26 had been interpreted to indicate that so long as the source of the aid based on need permitted partial qualifiers was not the athletics department, the student could receive it. Several delegates expressed concern with the interpretation, noting that there is a formula for determining aid based on need and an athletics department should be allowed to provide the aid following the formula as well as a financial aid office.

There was significant discussion about Proposal No. 30 and the 13 amendments to amendments that had been submitted. Primarily, the discussion had to do with parliamentary procedure in handling the proposal and amendments. A straw vote was taken on Proposal No. 30—1, which would expand the call in No. 30 to develop recommen-

dations to reduce time demands to all sports. The vote indicated that Division I-AAA favored the amendment. A straw vote regarding an effort to table all of Proposal No. 30 indicated that Division I-AAA also favored that.

Academics

A sponsor of Proposal No. 38, which would permit nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers in Division I to earn a fourth season of eligibility at the beginning of their fifth academic year if they have achieved a specified number of units toward a degree, explained the pros and cons of the legislation. It was noted that the primary objection had been that it would "send the wrong message to high school students" that they would get four years of eligibility regardless of whether the requirements of Bylaw 14.3 were met. On the positive side, it was noted that the legislation would give partial qualifiers the opportunity to "earn" a year of eligibility. A straw vote indicated that Division I-AAA was not in favor of the legislation.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 9:57 a.m.]

Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1990

The Division II business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University, presiding.

Mr. Hughes: Good morning, and welcome to the Division II business session. My name is Jerry Hughes. I am the vice president of the Division II Steering Committee.

[NOTE: Members of the Division II Steering Committee were introduced, and the Convention publications and voting procedures were reviewed.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Packages

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): Proposal Nos. 1 through 23 are in this year's consent package. We will be voting on those in the general session. These proposals have been included in the consent group because the NCAA Council considers them to be noncontroversial. Each has your Division II Steering Committee's and Council's full support, and I urge the adoption of this legislation. One note: Proposal No. 12 will be withdrawn because there is an amendment to the amendment; however, that is a Division I item and it will come up on the floor.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): This Presidents Commission grouping, I feel, will be a group that will get the most discussion; and I am pleased that we have with us today President Jim Appleberry, who is serving currently as the chair of the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission. Also, we have President Asa Green, who is the incoming chair of that Division II group to answer any questions that you might have regarding any of these particular proposals.

What I would like to do is call your attention to the fact that only those proposals here that have an asterisk by it are those that are presented to you by the Presidents Commission. All the others are presented by some university grouping other than the Presidents Commission. The Commission simply wanted a roll-call vote on each of these so that we could see later on who voted how on each of these items. Since the amendments require a roll-call vote, amendments-to-amendments also will require roll-call votes. And I am very pleased to tell you we have a lot of amendments-to-amendments in this area. So, tomorrow I am sure that we will spend a great deal of time on roll-call votes on amendments-to-amendments.

There is only one piece of legislation in this grouping that we will take action on this morning, and that is No. 29. Now, if I may, I will go back to Proposal No. 24. This is the amendment that Dick Schultz spoke to last night, and this requires that our admissions and graduation rates be publicized. This is both in Division I and Division II; however, there is one page that differs for Division I from Division I. Division I will start this reporting in 1991; Division II, in October 1 of 1994. Division I already has been checking data and can do the reporting in 1991, whereas Division II has not been and will not be able to do the reporting until 1994. Amendment-to-amendment No. 24-1, is for Division I only. And it just simply changes that date from October 1 to November 1. The Council understands that that is already year-old information, so there really should be no reason why they would want to change that date.

The second amendment-to-amendment, 24-2, does involve Division II. It involves averaging the ACT data that we would be reporting. On the back of that sheet, you have amendment-to-amendment 24-3, which also will involve averaging the admissions data. And then, 24-4 will change the reporting by race to reporting for all students. If you recall from yesterday, Proposal Nos. 26, 27 and 28 were reordered. They were reordered so that No. 27 will come before 28, and 26, then, will follow 28. No. 27 does away with Proposition 42. No. 28 delays implementation of Proposition 42. And No. 26 is what the Presidents Commission is recommending for Proposition 42.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Receipt of Nonathletics Financial Assistance—Nonqualifier

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposition 29, on behalf of the Division II Steering Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention, there was considerable discussion about Proposition 42. As a result of that discussion, the Division II Steering Committee took under advisement many of the items that were presented at that time. For the benefit of the membership, as you recall, Proposition 42 as it now stands, disallows financial aid—institutional financial aid for nonqualifiers—if they were recruited to an institution for athletics purposes. Proposition No. 29 clears this matter up by allowing a student-athlete who is a nonqualifier and was recruited to an institution but who is not going to be participating in intercollegiate athletics to receive institutional-based aid.

The Division II Steering Committee believes strongly that this provides the access that is needed to student-athletes who are nonqualifiers and ends the discrimination against them in terms of their participation in institutional-based aid, allowing them to continue their education. I urge the adoption of this proposal.

Marleen Bingle: (National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrator): I urge your support of this proposal. This will allow institutions to be in compliance with the rules and regulations of the

United States Department of Education in relation to Title IV funds. It will allow our students to get work-study and supplemental grants as well as regular institutional-based aid, and I urge your adoption of this change.

[Proposal No. 29 (Page A-31) was approved by Division II, 153-11, roll-call vote.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): If you'll recall yesterday, Nos. 30 and 31 also were reordered. So No. 31 will be taken up before 30. I will call your attention to the interpretation sheets where there is one dealing with Proposals 30 and 31 and what the student-athlete football player may participate in.

No. 31 is a proposal being presented by the Council, dealing with spring football practice. It reduces the number of practice days from 20 to 12 in a time frame of 24 days instead of 36 days, and it allows only two hours per session; it is effective immediately. No. 30 differs from 31 in that it will allow us only 10 practice days with no limit on time and would be effective next year instead of this spring session.

Also with No. 30, there are a number of amendments. Amendment No. 30—1 simply delays all of this another year. You recall that as a part of No. 30 we are to study all sports other than football and basketball. The amendment would insert football and basketball—we would study those, also—and bring it all back in one big package next year.

Amendment No. 30—2 involves Division II football and would set limitations for a maximum of two hours of practice per day. No. 30—3 would eliminate the no-contact provision. No. 30—4 also would allow contact and give us 21 consecutive days with 15 days of practice. No. 30—5 deals with Divisions I and III. No. 30—6 deals with Division II and is from the Division II Steering Committee. I think this is one that many of you had questions on. This reestablishes the conditioning date for basketball, takes it back to October 1st, as it is in the legislation for Divisions I and III, instead of October 15th. I understand that the Presidents Commission agrees with that amendment, that adjustment. No. 30—7 moves back to 28 the permissible number of basketball games, instead of 25. No. 30—8 is a Division I only call. No. 30—9 is Division I only. No. 30—11 is Division I only, and my understanding is that the Presidents Commission and the Council are supporting this amendment. Nos. 30—12 and 30—13 are Division I only.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): The Presidents Commission yesterday afternoon made a couple of changes in our recommendations. For one, we want to support No. 30—6, which would change the conditioning date for basketball from October 15 to October 1. Quite frankly, when the Presidents Commission's Executive Committee and the NCAA Council met in October, we thought coming out of that meeting that this had been changed so that we were consistent with the other divisions. When the printed

information came out, we were not. So we are supporting this change.

Yesterday in the Presidents Commission meeting, we discussed, among all the divisions, the impact of Proposal No. 30. We agreed, after listening to a number of the presidents from all over the country, and reviewing the impact that No. 30 as it originally was stated would have on some of our schools in the NCAA, to ask that the NCAA Council place before you No. 30—11, and we are supporting this for Division II. No. 30—11 Section B, which would open up the exception once every four years for competition with those that are currently in the regulations.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): I think most of you know that Alaska and Hawaii are remote locations. We understand what the Presidents Commission is trying to do, but I am not sure that everybody understands why the exceptions were put in in the first place, to help institutions in remote locations that are trying to run NCAA programs in Division II and Division I in Alaska and Hawaii. The legislation that President Appleberry spoke of did not receive a unanimous vote in the Council yesterday. I was the only one voting against it, because I think I am the only one who understands the impact that taking away these exceptions will have on our program, not only on the basketball program, but possibly in the future on our ice hockey program and all of our other programs.

That's why there is concern for the Great Alaska Shootout. We have no Division I institutions in Alaska. We don't intend to go to Division I. It's 1,500 miles to Seattle. There is one Division II institution in Seattle. The rest are in the lower 48 states. It's difficult to operate a program by taking away the exceptions or allowing them only once every four years. For those of you who might want to visit, we pay airfare for everybody, both men and women. We might not be able to do that in the future. I am very concerned about our operation and being a competitive NCAA Division II program, if any of these exceptions are passed.

Currently, we have exceptions. We have had those exceptions since the inception of our Division II program, both for Alaska-Anchorage, and Alaska-Fairbanks. Why are we now all of a sudden saying that the exceptions don't work?

I think the answers for us is to send it back to the committee again. Let us have some input from the Alaska and Hawaii schools to reconsider on the basketball issues. I am afraid that as we reconsider, if we can reconsider the basketball, we are looking also at reductions for next year in other sports, and it will affect all of our programs. So I urge you at this point to have some consideration for those two remote states that are part of the Union, so that we may be able to continue with our programs in Alaska and Hawaii—all of our programs, not just basketball.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I am a member of the Presidents Commission. I think it may be important to point out that the proposals from the Presidents Commission to put some reasonable limits on practice and playing seasons is a result of the AIR research,

and it's a direct response to concerns voiced by student-athletes, as summarized in that research, that in fact the demands of competition are excessive and may be expressed in terms of impeding their academic progress.

The Commission, therefore, in October proposed legislation to put what we believe are modest limits on football and basketball, plus the resolution to study the other sports. It appeared in our discussions, and I think from prior discussions and debate through the years, that the problems in basketball and football are fairly obvious. It was clear that when we in October, in the original proposal, wiped out the exceptions that we gave rise to some very appropriate concerns. And our support of No. 30—11 represents a response to those concerns developed after lengthy discussion in our meeting.

We think it is reasonable for each institution, once every four years, to be able to take advantage of the exceptions that are set forth in the amendment. It will preserve all of the exceptions with the limit that an institution may avail themselves of it only once every four years. We think that it will be helpful in those situations where the exceptions are justified that if further adjustments are needed we can come back to them. But I think it important, and the Commission feels it important, that we take a stand now to indicate that we are going to try and reduce the demands on our student-athletes. Thank you.

Mike Vasconcellos (Chaminade University): I can appreciate what the Presidents Commission is trying to say. I just think we have a unique situation in terms of our geography, and I would like to remind you that we are part of the United States of America. We are not a foreign country. We need some kind of assistance in terms of having teams come over to Hawaii and for us to travel.

Our situation is this year, just in basketball alone, after today's date, we have three home games until March 12. Our season ends on March 21st. The rest of our games are on the road. So we will have some difficulty in terms of maintaining just our membership compliance if this legislation is passed. I think a trip to Alaska and Hawaii has much educational value. I don't believe you can reduce time commitment by just eliminating an opportunity for a team or an institution to go to our remote location. We can look to other ways in term of reducing student time.

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): That brings us to Proposal No. 32. In the blue sheets, you have an interpretation. There was some concern as to what the students could use when on campus during that summer orientation session or study session, and this defines more clearly what the student-athlete may use.

I understand that No. 33 will be moot if 32 passes. That brings us to No. 34, which is a Division I football proposal. We understand that No. 35 may be withdrawn, and No. 36 also may be withdrawn. And No. 37 is a Pell Grant issue for Division I.

Academics

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): No. 38, as indicated, is Division I only. No. 39 has to do with satisfactory-progress exceptions, and the intent of 39, as you see, is to clarify the midyear enrollment of a nonrecruited student-athlete related to the NCAA satisfactory-progress rule. These are exceptions rather than waivers, and as such, can be administered by the institution rather than by conference members of the Association or the Eligibility Committee.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Test-Score Report—Division II

Mr. Shields: On behalf of the Council and the Division II Steering Committee, I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

On the recommendation of the Academic Requirements Committee, the Council has adopted an interpretation that would require the ACT or the SAT score utilized to certify a student-athlete's eligibility to come directly from the testing service. The Division II Steering Committee believes that such an interpretation is unduly restrictive for our Division II members, particularly when our institutions are required to certify the eligibility of a large member of walk-on students. Adoption of this proposal would permit a Division II member institution to obtain a student's test score from either the testing certificate advisors or from the official copy of the student's high-school transcript. The steering committee urges your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 40 (Page A-50) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): I will call your attention now to Proposal No. 41. This is a Division I vote. There are two amendments-to-amendments, and there is also an interpretation on this one, No. 7. What this proposal does is provide for a \$150 payment to students for costs associated with supplies and sundry materials involved in courses. And as you see, Nos. 41—1 and 41—2, the two amendments-to-amendments, provide additional language regarding that change.

Proposal No. 42 deals with summer school financial aid. On this one, the change is effective immediately. It changes no rules at all regarding summer school financial aid, but it does change the voting on financial aid for summer school to a federated vote, as opposed to a dominant vote for everyone.

Proposal No. 43 is a stiffening of the summer school regulations or tightening of those regulations, and the intent is that if a student has not received financial aid in the previous year, they cannot receive a grant-in-aid for summer school.

No. 44 is Division I-AA football only. No. 45 is I-AA football. No. 46 is I-A football. No. 47 is a proposal that is basically a further

clarification of some action that the Convention took last year. The intent here, and it's effective immediately, is that the specified returned earnings of a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport during the preceding academic year are exempt from the grant-in-aid or cost-of-attendance limitation. This helps clean up some changes that were made last year.

No. 48 deals with equivalency calculations, and there is an amendment to this one.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Equivalency Exemption—Academic Honor Awards

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): For the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 50 simply allows us in Division II what Division III presently has available. If you would look at your NCAA Manual on page 44, you will see that this is identical language to that that Division III now has available. What it allows is that a student who comes to you and meets your institutional guidelines for academic honor awards and also meets certain criteria—such as being in the upper 20 percent of the high-school graduating class, having at least a 3.500 grade-point average, or having an ACT score of 24 or above—could receive an honor award that you give to all students. Those dollars would then not count in the equivalency for that student-athlete.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Has the ACT score been adjusted for the new inflated scores that are being reported this year?

Mr. Wyatt: It has not.

Mr. Hammond: So then, the impact of this would be that we would be adopting a standard that would be approximately two points lower, depending upon which piece of data you want to believe? The problem is for those of you who are not familiar with the ACT that ACT has changed its test this year. The results from the first few test dates indicate approximately a two-point higher score from the same kind of student. I didn't know whether or not the committee had taken that into consideration or not.

Mr. Wyatt: I believe Steve (Morgan) can tell you that in all of the legislation that we have that deals with the 15 ACT test score that when we go to the enhanced score, we will use a concordance of 18.

Stephen R. Morgan: I think that based on the precedent this year, that we would have to do it by legislative proposal—in the consent package once the concordance score was identified—rather than making that change editorially.

Mr. Wyatt: Mr. Chair, I am not speaking against the proposal; I think it's a good proposal. But I think it's a misrepresentation to say it's the same as what Division III has had before, because it's a highly stringent standard.

Mr. Hughes: I would note that Division III will have to do the same thing.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-57) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): You will recall that in the opening session yesterday, Items 52, 53, and 54 were reordered. No. 52 will be taken first, followed by 54, and then No. 53. We will comment briefly on each of those.

Proposal No. 52, if passed, would strengthen individual sanctions and would distinguish between the use of banned drugs and "street drugs." Further, it would distinguish between penalties for a first- and second-time positive drug test on the part of an individual student-athlete. Proposal No. 54 would specify that team-eligibility sanctions would not apply except as noted and currently applied. Proposal No. 53 would establish a year-round drug-testing program and would abolish the Association's current program, the voluntary off-season drug-testing program.

Proposal No. 55, involving the drug-testing consent form, would administer this form separately from the student-athlete statement. It would specify that failure to sign the statement would have the results of the student-athlete losing eligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition for that year. It would further specify that failure to sign would result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in postseason competition for that year.

No. 56 is a Division I-only issue, as is No. 57.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Seasons of Competition—Division II Track and Cross Country

Walter H. Ryle IV (Northeast Missouri State University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow individual student-athletes in the sport of track and field the opportunity to compete separately in indoor and outdoor track. This would not, I repeat, would not affect the current Division II sports-sponsorship criteria. Track and field would continue to count as one sport. It would make Division II consistent with current rules for Divisions I and III in track and field.

[Proposal No. 59 (Page A-66) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): Proposal No. 60 is a graduate-student eligibility question—all divisions common vote. The intent is before you in the Program. I have word that No. 61 will be withdrawn. With No. 62, regarding junior college transfer eligibility, the discontinued, nonsponsored sport exception will be a Divisions I and II issue divided vote. It merely would confirm that a partial qualifier or nonqualifier transferring to a Division I or Division II institution from a two-year college or a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program shall not be permitted

to utilize the discontinued, nonsponsored sport exception to the transfer residence requirement.

Proposal No. 63, regarding transfer eligibility, is a Division I and Division II divided vote. It would confirm that waivers of the transfer requirement are available in the first academic year of residence only for transfer student-athletes from four-year colleges who are qualifiers per Bylaw 14.02.9.1. Proposal No. 64, dealing with a one-time transfer exception and financial aid is a Divisions I and II divided-vote issue. The intent is to delete the consideration of a student-athlete's financial aid or team-membership status at the original institution from the one-time exception to the transfer residence requirement.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

One-Time Transfer Exception—Division II

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

First thing I'd like to do is call your attention to the intent. We have to add a few words in there. At the end of the first line, after Division II, add the words "or Division III." As you know, Division III traditionally has had a relaxed transfer rule, which last year's Convention finally eliminated completely. Prior to last year's Convention, but especially now, the 14 members of our conference have found that increasingly large numbers of transfers, especially in football and basketball have been bypassing our schools in favor of Division III schools, largely due to the fact they can become immediately eligible, as opposed to sitting out for a year.

In view of this situation, our conference has decided to present Proposal Nos. 65 and 67 at this year's Convention. They are designed to make Division II more attractive to transfer student-athletes.

Now, regarding No. 65, the one-time transfer exception, as you know, has been with us since 1984 and has undergone refinement, especially tightening-up of the language in the area of financial aid, at practically every Convention since then. It's now essentially recognized as a good rule. However, as you know, it always has excluded student-athletes who participate in the sport of football, basketball and ice hockey. We feel it's time, after six years, in Division II to stop discriminating against these football, basketball, and ice hockey players and to now include them, also. Bypassing this proposal, transfers still will be required to meet the four criteria before they can be granted immediate eligibility.

As you know, those who have not and cannot have transferred previously, have to meet the financial aid provision, the academic-standing provision and have to have approval of the previous institution. The last of which is the safeguard for every athletics administrator. If you feel something is amiss, or if there is hanky-panky in your particular situation, you can merely exercise your option of not granting approval.

So we feel that this is a good proposal and it's time that we included football, basketball and ice hockey players. And we appreciate your support on No. 65.

Mr. Hughes: For clarification, in your original intent you indicated that this was for Division II or III. The speaker might be reminded that Division II can take action only on issues pertaining to Division II in this session, and Division III does not currently have this legislation.

Mr. Eberle: Right. All we are talking about here is transfers from Division III wanting to come into Division II. We checked on it with the NCAA.

Mr. Hughes: This legislation would permit the student-athlete to come from anyplace, including Division I.

Mr. Eberle: Well, it would not permit them to come now from Division I in football, basketball and ice hockey.

Mr. Hughes: Currently, that's correct.

Mr. Eberle: So, it doesn't change, really, anything.

Mr. Hughes: If this is adopted, it would.

Mr. Eberle: No, it would just permit from Division II to Division II basketball, football and ice hockey. And it would allow the transfers from Division III in football, basketball and ice hockey, also. Basically, the only change is, it would allow football, basketball and ice hockey players to move from Division II to II and football, ice hockey and basketball players from Division III to move to Division II. That's the only thing that this piece of legislation deals with.

Mr. Hughes: I am advised by our NCAA representative that that is not correct. This would allow a student-athlete to transfer from anyplace and be eligible at Division II in those sports identified, immediately.

Mr. Eberle: Not from Division I football, basketball, and ice hockey; because the way it's written is, that's the exception. I checked with the NCAA prior to this, and they said it was in order.

Stephen R. Morgan (NCAA): The proposal is certainly in order; but the fact is, that you don't have anything in there that would continue to exempt people based on where they are coming from. What your proposal would do is continue to preserve, because this body has no power to change the rule for students transferring into Division I schools. This would say that you no longer would have a certain sport exempted in Division II from the use of this provision. It does not address where those students are coming from. It merely talks about what they are coming to, which is Division II in any sport.

So you would have to have a different kind of amendment to address the question of where the students are coming from if you do not want this to apply to students coming from Division I institutions—language similar to the paragraph that is in the legislation now related to students coming from Division III institutions, which has a provision that you can't provide them aid in the first year. So this legislation, as drafted, would allow students coming from

Division I to take advantage of their immediate eligibility if they met the criteria.

Mr. Eberle: They can now, except in those three sports.

Mr. Morgan: That is correct, and you are eliminating those three sports. Now, they could in any sport if this was adopted.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Direct your attention to Subparagraph A. My reading is that it says, "The student is a participant in a sport other than Division I basketball." That specifies that a Division I basketball player couldn't transfer.

Mr. Morgan: What that's talking about is a transfer. You are talking about after the student is in. If he's at a Division II school, he's not going to be playing Division II basketball.

Mr. Hammond: No, that's not what it says.

Mr. Hughes: Currently, it says basketball. Currently, the legislation says basketball. It doesn't address where the student is coming from. What this would do—I am just clarifying for the membership—is indicate that the transfer could come from anywhere.

Mr. Eberle: I would like to challenge the interpretation on that. Right now, anybody can come from Division I down to Division II in any sport except football, basketball and ice hockey. We haven't changed anything for someone moving from Division I to Division II at all. We haven't changed anything in the present regulation. All we are changing is in regard to a transfer from II to II and III to II in basketball, football and ice hockey.

Mr. Morgan: To say it one more time: What you have done, really, is make it so that you are treating, if this were adopted, the sports listed—football, basketball, ice hockey—the same as all the other sports in Division II. You would allow Division I to continue to not treat those sports the same. You don't have any way to effect that. This does not treat the question of where these students are coming from. It merely treats the question of what sport they are going to participate in at your institution.

Mr. Hammond: I interpret the legislation that it's based on the sport they participated in at the previous institution.

Mr. Hughes: The previous interpretation is the way we proceeded during the pre-Convention Council meeting. We can, after discussion, if you want to, carry it over to tomorrow's session and get a ruling by the Council.

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): I would like to thank the sponsors for this proposal; because I think if we take the interpretation that is being given by the NCAA, we would have an advantage in that it would allow Division I student-athletes to come to Division II and not be directed only to Division III. So I think that we need to take it as it is being suggested.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): In the NCAA Manual, 14.6.5.3.10, Part A, reads: "The student is a participant in a sport other than Division I basketball, Division I-A or I-AA football, or Division I men's ice hockey." Right now, that is all inclusive. That means that athletes in those three sports cannot

transfer and be immediately eligible; is that correct?

Mr. Hughes: In Divisions I and II, that is correct.

Ms. Taylor: Now, this amendment inserts in front of each of those sports the modifier, Division I, Division I-A or I-AA, and Division I again in front of those three sports. It now restricts it only to the athletes coming from those Division I programs, which then opens it to athletes coming into a Division II institution from a Division II or III program. Before it was all inclusive. Now, it's restricted under this legislation. It restricts only the Division I athlete; is that not correct?

Mr. Hughes: Transferring to a Division I school.

Ms. Taylor: To anywhere. Because it now applies, as it is currently written, to Division II. If the only thing that this amendment does is modify the Division I part of it, then it simply restricts only Division I. III's to II or II's to II would then immediately be eligible.

Mr. Morgan: This does not now address at all where these athletes are coming from. It talks about the sport that they intend to participate in at your school.

Ms. Taylor: But it does address the question, insofar as they are coming from anywhere. Is that not correct?

Mr. Morgan: They could be coming from Divisions I, II, III, NAIA schools, nonmember schools. And they can take advantage of this in other sports, as long as they meet the criteria. All this proposal does is say that Division II no longer wants to treat football, basketball and ice hockey differently than the other sports. And, therefore, you still aren't considering the place from which the student is coming. You are just talking about how you treat those people in your sports on your campus. And this proposal rightfully, because it can't change the rule for Division I, inserts the words that say Division I continues to treat football, basketball and ice hockey differently.

But Division II, now, if this was adopted, would treat all sports the same, and that would mean that you wouldn't care where they came from. It would only be the sport they are going to play at your place that would matter. It is consistent with the rule, the way the rule is currently written, and the exceptions that are in it now.

Ms. Taylor: If it currently restricts all athletes in those three sports coming from anywhere—as you said, I, II, III, NAIA—by leaving it open with no modifier, and you then put in a single modifier—that is Division II—would it not then only restrict athletes coming from Division I?

Mr. Morgan: That's not what the modifier does at all, no. I don't think you are reading it properly, because I am saying that now it doesn't address where they are coming from. You are not introducing any element that addresses where they are coming from. You are just changing the sports that are affected by the rule.

Olin B. Sansbury Jr. (University of South Carolina at Spartanburg): As I understand the purpose of this legislation, restricting transfers to begin with so as not to encourage students to move around among institutions for purposes of athletics competition,

regardless of what interpretation we finally give to whatever is on here, it seems to me that we ought to be doing things to encourage students to focus on their academic purposes, rather than to be moving around among institutions—finding other places to compete. So I would think that a large part of our whole focus here is a mistake, and we should not be doing anything to expand transfer exceptions.

Wayne S. Pierce (California State University, Stanislaus): I believe this legislation would be clearer if it were reworded to indicate the sport in which the student intends to participate. I don't think a student can participate until these exceptions are met.

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I'd like to speak in support of this, and sort of let student-athletes' mothers worry about what they want to be in Division I. The question is, does Division II want to continue, for some reason unbeknownst to me, to have these exceptions for football, basketball and ice hockey or do we wish to treat them all the same? I believe they should be treated all the same, and we should stop as much as we can having these separate. We allow all the other sports to transfer; and for some reason in these three sacred sports, these young people are not permitted to transfer. We have everything in place, we have the preventive that the administrator can say you can't go and I vote in support and urge you to, also.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): I'd like the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference to indicate if the way the chair is interpreting this is the way the conference would like after Proposal 67 to address it.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): I make no pretense of understanding the nuance of the language in this. The thing I am having difficulty with is the sponsor's intent to make Division II more attractive. I am wondering; attractive to whom. I am not sure how we make Division II more attractive to make it possible to have free access among our member institutions. It seems to me if we do indeed follow the principles addressed by Mr. Morgan, allowing Division I athletes in basketball, football and ice hockey to transfer down, then we indeed are more attractive to the kid who took the chance in Division I and would now like to move into a Division II program. If we are more attractive by allowing free movement among our Division II schools seems to me to be looking at each other with a little bit of a covetous eye.

Mr. Eberle: If you look at what our objective was and look at both Proposal Nos. 65 and 67, our objective was this: To get football, basketball and ice hockey transfers from any division eligible immediately in Division II. We needed two proposals, we feel, to accomplish this objective. We couldn't leave the present one-time transfer exception rule intact.

In other words, all our provisions would apply to Divisions I and II alike, as it is now, and accomplish our objective since Division I wouldn't want their football, basketball and ice hockey players transferring within Division I and receive immediate eligibility. So,

we wrote 65 to cover football, basketball and ice hockey transfers from Division II to Division II and from Division III to Division II. We wrote 67 to cover football, basketball and ice hockey transfers and all the other sports because we just left it as the old Division III transfer rule—football, basketball and ice hockey from Division I to Division II. So we felt in order to accomplish our objectives, we had to write both of those proposals.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-69) was defeated by Division II.]

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania Athletic Conference): I still believe the interpretation of our present one-time exception is incorrect, and I think that is what killed the proposal. Can I request that over the lunch hour you huddle up and find out because I think that the confusion killed it. I request that somehow we get out of this.

Mr. Hughes: I hear your request. My recommendation would be that tonight when the Council meets, we will present our interpretation. Tomorrow morning during the window of reconsideration, if that interpretation is different than what we reported, we will report that to Division II membership. Then, someone voting on the prevailing side, which would be a no vote, may move to reconsider.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): Proposal No. 66 is a "4-2-4" college transfer eligibility issue that would require that the transferable degree credit have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000. This would bring us to Proposal No. 67.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Transfer Eligibility—Division II

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

Presently, transfers from Division I to Division II, with the exception of football, basketball and ice hockey players, can qualify for immediate eligibility if they meet the provision of the one-time transfer exception. However, no provision currently exists for transfer in football, basketball and ice hockey to receive immediate eligibility. Too many players coming from I in those sports merely bypass Division II and enroll in Division III institution where they can receive immediate eligibility. This proposal, which is merely the old Division III transfer rule, is intended to make Division II more attractive to transfers in football, basketball and ice hockey, thereby preventing their losses to Division III schools. It also pertains to transfers in all sports.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-70) was approved by Division II.]

[The Division II business session was recessed for 10 minutes.]

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COST REDUCTION

Mr. Hughes: I would like at this time to introduce Marvin G. Carmichael who is the director of financial aid at Clemson University.

Marvin G. Carmichael (Clemson University): If you will bear with me, the document which you have received is designed for an overhead, but we are going to walk through this presentation sequentially. I hope that my presentation will offer some explanation as to what need-based aid is all about.

The Special Committee on Cost Reduction was established with a specific charge of identifying means for reducing costs in intercollegiate athletics. During this report, we will attempt to review factors; provide you with a brief explanation regarding defining financial need, and as Gene Corrigan reported yesterday, all the preliminary indications regarding the committee's attitude toward need-based aid. The committee reviewed a wide range of options, including developing a totally need-based aid system; a system with athletics grants covering tuition fees and additional aid based on need, and third, athletics grants covering tuition fees with additional funds awarded on the basis of need except for a specific number of full grants, which would be awarded in each sport—athletics grants covering tuition fees, room, board and course-related books, with additional funds up to the cost of attendance based on defined financial need with reduction in numbers of grants in aid.

In considering a need-based aid program, it's essential that you understand the basic principle in defining student financial need. I refer you now to the first page of the handout, which you have received. Plainly and simply, financial need is defined as cost of attendance minus family contribution. Family contribution being the amount that the family can contribute to the cost of a student attending a particular institution.

I think most of you need to be aware completely as to what cost of attendance is all about. This seems to be the most misunderstood part of financial aid. This handout indicates that there are items used in the financial aid office regarding cost of attendance that differs somewhat from the commonly accepted educational expense used in the administration of athletics grants. Under tuition fees, the room and board is included in both. Books, supplies, transportation and personal expenses are not included in the athletics aid, but are included in the financial aid office budget as part of the total cost of attending school.

Standards must be defined clearly to calculate the ability of a family to contribute to the student's cost of attendance. That includes both the parents and the student, when the student is dependent on the parent. The process of defining need should be consistent with the same standards and defining eligibility for need-based financial aid.

Congressional methodology is used for most Federal and institutional student aid programs. Usually, a service agency such as College Scholarship Services or American Top College-Testing Services provides this information and generally at a fee. I think we need to look at a couple of case examples, and I am going to start off by saying these are just typical situations. You could take this

information back to your campus, go to your financial aid office, ask them to provide you with cost-of-attendance data and really come up with an analysis on your own campus, which I would encourage you to do. It's important to see what effect any aid would have on a student-athlete.

On the third page of the document you have an example of need determination. We are going to assume that we have three students—Student A, Student B and Student C at the same institution, same kind of student. We are going to assume that the cost of attendance is the same, we are going to say \$6,000 in this scenario.

The next handout includes family contribution. We are just going to come up with an assumption, so bear with me here. This is an assumption, but I think these represent typical situations. Family contribution to student aid is \$700 for Student A; Student B, \$1,500, and Student C, \$4,000. So how do you calculate financial need? We have what it costs to go to school; we have what the family can contribute. Logically, the difference is the amount of financial need that the student has. Student A has \$5,300, Student B has \$4,500, and Student C has need of \$2,000. Let's continue on. Let's compare financial need to grant need of allowable limits at this point. Let's come up with how to define a grant-in-aid in this scenario. We are going to assume, just for simplicity's sake, that supplies of A are \$300. I just pulled that out of air so that we can come up with a \$200 value for books. If you add tuition fees, room and board, and books, you come up with a grant-in-aid budget of \$4,200 for each of the students.

Let's put another wrinkle into it. The Pell Grant. Let's define what we think the Pell Grant is going to be valued at. For Student A, we are going to assume the value is \$2,300—we are assuming this is a destitute student. Student B has a moderate need, \$1,400. For Student C, the need is not quite as great; he's probably not going to be eligible for Pell. It's important to understand that—eligibility for Pell versus noneligibility for Pell.

In our example, we are going to use a \$1,400 limitation on Pell, which is what is used in Division I, obviously. In Division II, it is \$900. What does this mean to the maximum amounts that students can receive? All you have to do is increase the athletics budget by \$1,400, and you come up with the new limit that the student-athlete can receive. Student A, \$5,600, Student B \$5,600, because they both had at least \$1,400 in Pell Grant money.

Student C didn't get any Pell money, so he's got to stay at \$4,200, which is what we defined a full grant-in-aid as being. How much less, then, in a need-based environment—if you apply need principles totally to this situation—would a student get under the current situation if you applied need? Student A would get \$300 less. Now, this is the destitute student in a need-based environment. Student C would get \$1,100 less. Student B would get \$2,200 less. So, you can see that students are going to get less in this scenario.

Now, it's going to vary a little bit from institution to institution,

based on indirect costs. It is possible for needy students to receive more money under a need-based program depending on the institution, and what it uses—the costs-of-attendance amounts, supplies, transportation, personal expenses and any adjustment to family contributions.

At most institutions, the student-athlete will receive less money under a need-based system. Because so many more students would be receiving less money on a need-based financial aid system, most institutions would realize a cost savings. This is what we actually were looking at; many institutions would save money. The amount of savings would vary from institution to institution, depending on the current level of financial aid commitment and the type of student-athlete being recruited.

Any cost savings would be offset by significant other problems, and I think this is important for you to understand. Timing, for example. Coaches would not be able to make scholarship commitments in respect to student-athletes in the current time frame, because recruiting takes place far in advance of any current determination of need. This is due to Federal regulatory enforcement, assuming we use national standards. Most decisions, in fact, are not made until after April 15th. Why April 15th? That's the magical date when we have to submit tax forms. Grant-in-aid-eligibility determination would follow the legislative calendar of the U.S. Congress. And this includes annual adjustment.

Any attempt to give coaches an early need assessment, which does not currently exist, would really be costly to develop; and any such attempt would be only preliminary in nature with limited levels of assurance from which a student-athlete would be required to make institutional decisions. Timing; professional judgment; verification of data; defining cost of attendance, all of which vary from institution to institution, questions a level playing field. When comparing offers made by different institutions, confusion and suspicion will accompany student decision making.

Additional administrative complexities and pressures placed on the institution, specifically on the financial aid office, will be an integral part of the implementations concept. Because most student-athletes, even those with moderate to high need, would receive less money under a need-based financial aid system, the perceived opportunities for student-athletes to attend institutions of higher learning would be reduced.

The Special Committee on Cost Reduction was established with the specific charge of identifying means for reducing cost in intercollegiate athletics without denying access to higher education or significantly altering the competitive balance among member institutions. It is the committee's current position that a system of awarding financial aid to student-athletes, at least in part, on the basis of need, would by nature deny some access to students, would deny some students any access and would have a high potential for altering the competitive balance among NCAA member institutions. And it would

contain significant potential for abuse, particularly during the recruiting process.

Any cost savings realized by reducing grants-in-aid through the application of need would be more than offset through additional administrative and programmatic costs. For these reasons, the committee believes that despite the potential cost savings involved, the committee will not recommend further consideration of any need-based aid system.

The committee is, however, looking at a reduction in numbers; and as Gene Corrigan reported, we have not decided definitively what that number should be. My objective is to provide some understanding of what a need-based aid program is all about; it is very complex. I think you have to have some indication as to how it's going to affect your institution before you decide whether or not it's a positive approach for you.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Reconsideration of Transfer Eligibility—Division II (No. 67)

Mr. Hughes: We will now return to the agenda; and just so that all the delegates know a couple of things, there were several questions during the break. Proposal No. 67 which passed, would add just an additional exception to the transfer rule. It would be that you would not have to meet any of the current standards for the one-time transfer. You need a letter signed by the director of athletics of a Division I institution. The student-athlete would be effective immediately,—immediately if the rule is in effect—which means at the end of the Convention.

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I voted on the prevailing side of this issue in a moment of stupidity, I believe, for No. 67, and I move to reconsider.

[The motion was seconded.]

What we have actually done, and no one believes more in availing students of the opportunity to transfer than I do, but we have now permitted an athlete who is not making satisfactory progress at a Division I institution to come now to a Division II institution and compete. Therefore, I urge that we defeat this motion, perhaps go back to No. 65 to see if we can do anything there and, if not, prepare new legislation for the next Convention that might give some of us who would like some more flexibility for basketball, football and ice hockey the opportunity to prepare for that. But in any case, I think No. 67 would be extremely disastrous to us.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): Mr. Chair, you didn't respond to that. Is that correct? I think that the transfer still is held accountable for satisfactory progress.

Mr. Hughes: She is correct that the transfer does not have to meet satisfactory progress, under this provision. This would be an additional item under Bylaw 14, whereby as is printed in the publication all that student-athlete coming from I to II would have to do is receive a letter from the director of athletics of a Division I institution,

releasing that student-athlete.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 67 (Page A-70) was approved.]

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): I guess I was a little confused when I voted for that, as well. I get confused with these numbers. Bylaw 14.6.5.3.10 stays in the book and applies to a transfer from III going to II or II going to II. We just voted a few minutes ago and said we didn't want to do that. But now Bylaw 14.6.5.3.11 is a brand-new bylaw, if I understand it correctly. It says that everything else is in place—III to II, II to II—but if you want to go from Division I to Division II, you could do it—a kid could already have transferred from one Division I institution to another Division I institution and then changed his mind and wants to go to II—he could do that. He could transfer as many times as he wanted. He would not have to be in good academic standing, he could have been on aid. Isn't that all correct if we do pass it?

Mr. Hughes: That is all correct.

Mr. Elwell: With that in mind, I would urge that we do reconsider this and vote it down this time.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-70) was defeated by Division II after a successful motion to reconsider.]

Reconsideration of One-Time Transfer Exception—Division II (No. 65)

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I think there is a consensus here that we would like to be able to have basketball, football and ice hockey student-athletes be able to transfer and not exclude them from Bylaw 14.6.5.3.10. Now, I voted no, and I would move to reconsider Proposal No. 65.

Stephen R. Morgan: Again, to clarify what you are doing, as this matter was reviewed by the Division II Steering Committee prior to this session: If No. 65 were adopted, all you would be doing is treating basketball, football and ice hockey student-athletes coming into Division II institutions the same as students in all other sports. The criteria would all be in place. It wouldn't matter what institution those individuals were coming from, you still would analyze them under the criteria, the elements of Bylaw 14.6.5.3.10. If they met all those, they could participate immediately regardless of sport, if Proposal 65 was adopted.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I would just urge all of you, if this is clear, that this accomplishes what I think many of you want to accomplish, and that's to give these athletes in those three sports the same privileges that all other student-athletes have in transferring. I would urge you now to vote in favor of No. 65.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-69) was approved by Division II after a successful motion to reconsider.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

General

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): No. 68 deals with the legislative calendar. As most of you know, there will be a

change at the end of this Convention in the legislative calendar. This deals with the Association's amendment process to establish new deadlines for the amendments-to-amendments. In the past, we had to have only one institution propose an amendment-to-amendment. Now there are different rules for these amendments, as well as listing a primary contact person, a statement of intent and rationale for all the amendments-to-amendments.

No. 69, Part A, will be withdrawn. Part B deals with Division I. No. 70 deals with fencing to establish a combined score in the National Collegiate Men's and Women's Fencing Championships event. No. 71 is Division I-A football only, the same with No. 72. And 71 will be withdrawn. There is an amendment-to-amendment for 72 for Division I-A football.

No. 73 is for Division I. No. 74 is for Division III, although we all vote on it. No. 75 is for Division I-AA football. No. 76 is for Division I ice hockey.

No. 77 would permit associate or assistant athletics directors to count toward the minimum requirements for sports and rules committees—gives more people a chance to be on committees. No. 78 would enlarge the size of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, and No. 79 would do the same for the Division II Men's Basketball Committee. Currently, we have six members on that committee, representing eight regions. This is a recommendation from the Division I basketball committee as part of the enhancement for Division II basketball. It would give us representation from all the regions.

No. 80 has to do with fencing, and it establishes a combined Men's and Women's Fencing Committee. No. 81 deals with Division I men's ice hockey, adding a commissioner to the four current members. And No. 82 is a resolution to set up a Junior College Relations Committee.

Amateurism

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): These will all be a common-vote issues beginning with No. 83, Broken-Time Payments. It permits a student-athlete when not enrolled part time or full time to receive broken-time payments from the United States Olympic Committee or the national governing body in a sport, payments not to exceed \$250 per week during the time the athlete begins practice until one week after the conclusion of the competition without affecting eligibility.

No. 84, Forms of Pay, United States Olympic Committee Insurance Program, would allow individual athletes to receive full benefits of the health insurance program without affecting their intercollegiate eligibility. No. 85, Actual and Necessary Expenses, Equipment and Apparel, permits athletes to receive the apparel and equipment from amateur teams for practice and competition. No. 86, Permissible Awards, allows any personalized item to be awarded within the Association's limitations. If you want to review those limitations, they are on page 155 of your Manual.

No. 87, Transportation Between Terms, would permit athletics staff members to provide local transportation from railroad stations, airports or whatever back to the campuses during the semester break. No. 88, Academic Awards Banquet, would permit an additional banquet to be conducted to honor those students who achieve academic honors. This would be an additional banquet. If No. 88 passes, No. 89 would be moot. And 89 also would permit an academic-awards banquet, but it would have to be within the three that is allowed.

Playing Seasons

Sandra T. Shuler (North Carolina Central University): There are five proposals in this area that affect Division II; only two will be voted upon in this session. No. 90 is for Division I-A football only, and No. 91 is I-AA football, only.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Orientation Period—Division II Football

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania Athletic Conference): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale for this proposed legislation is to help the freshman football player. Sometimes for a freshman football player who may never have been away from home before, attending a preseason practice prior to the start of classes and normal campus life itself sometimes can be a rather traumatic experience. I think this proposal, which already is in effect for Divisions I-A and I-AA, merely affords those schools in Division II who wish to do so, the opportunity to conduct an orientation program for the freshman football players in order to ease their transition prior to return of the upperclassmen. We appreciate your support.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-91) was defeated by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Playing Seasons

Ms. Shuler: No. 93 is for Division I only. No. 94 is for Division I. No. 95, ice hockey starting date, is for Division I only. No. 96 has to do with contest limitation in Division I baseball.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Division II Baseball

Daniel G. Guerrero (California State University, Dominguez Hills): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 97 seeks to limit the application of the 26-week playing season to the academic year for Division II baseball. This proposal would provide a policy consistent with that which currently exists in Division I. I might add that Division III, at this Convention, also is proposing similar legislation, albeit for their 21-week playing season. In addition to that, Division I also is proposing legislation in support of softball that would be consistent with this. I think it would

be unwise for us to maintain a policy that would not provide consistency with the other divisions.

Wilburn A. Campbell Jr. [Albany State College (Georgia)]: I have a question related to the fact that we have schools both on a semester system as well as a quarter system, and we are talking about an academic year. Let's suppose that you have a semester of school that may end the academic year as early as the first or second week in May. The academic year is now over, and let's suppose that this same school is selected to participate in postseason play, which comes later. Would this school be allowed to have games during this interim period, that is, between the end of the academic year and postseason play?

Mr. Hughes: If you are selected for the Division II championship, you may continue to play and practice until that championship is held. This would have no bearing on it.

Mr. Campbell Jr.: I understand about play and practice, but what about competition?

Mr. Hughes: If you had not met your maximum number of contest dates, you could.

Jerry A. Miles (American Baseball Coaches Association): I would encourage the Division II membership to support this amendment. I know that a year ago it was defeated by a narrow margin, came up again and was defeated again. I am not sure about Division II; but I know for a fact in Division III that there were violations of this particular proposal—not the proposal, but the problem that we are trying to eliminate.

It's something that I think we owe to our student-athletes. If we want to provide them the best competition, the best coaching, we should allow coaches to coach teams in the summer that may include members from their institutions. I do not think it is abused heavily. I think a major concern is that there would be a substantial number of players from teams playing on these teams during the summer. This is always a possibility, but I do not think it would be heavily abused. I think, though, that you should look carefully at it.

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-92) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Playing Seasons

Sandra T. Shuler (North Carolina Central University): Proposal No. 98 is Division III only. Proposal No. 99 is Division I only, softball. No. 100 is women's volleyball, and it requires a divided vote. What this proposal will do is establish a preseason practice date for volleyball—the same as the 29 practice opportunities that is present in men's football. I guess most of you are familiar with that calculation. This will be voted upon in the general session. Proposal No. 101 establishes a season-ending volleyball tournament. Instead of having a championship exempted, or NAIA championship, or NCAA championship, it will exempt just one season-ending volleyball tournament. Proposal No. 102, season-ending fencing tournament, is

the same principle. It exempts one season-ending tournament. And No. 103 is Division III. Thank you.

Recruiting

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): Good morning, it is my pleasure to present to you the proposals for recruiting, beginning with No. 104. Within this package, there are seven proposals that pertain to Division II and several amendments as well as an interpretation. No. 104, Prospective Student-Athlete, is a clear definition of a prospective student-athlete as compared to a recruited student-athlete and, therefore, should be of great information for the membership.

No. 105, Official ACT and SAT Scores, would permit a Division I or Division II institution to pay a fee required by the appropriate testing agency for a prospective student-athlete. Proposal No. 106 does not pertain to our division. Proposal No. 107 also does not pertain to us. No. 108 also is a Division I-AA football proposal. No. 109 is for Division I, Women's Basketball Evaluations. Nos. 110 and 111 are Division I only.

And that brings us to Proposal No. 112, Printed Recruited Aids. The intent is to permit member institutions to provide preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities to those student-athletes who have signed a letter of intent.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Printed Recruiting Aids—Division II

Sandra T. Shuler (North Carolina Central University): On behalf of the Council and the Communications Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of Proposal 113 is to eliminate unnecessary expense in terms of duplicated recruiting material to be given or sent to prospective student-athletes. With the media guide that we currently can use and the student handbook that was adopted last year; student-related material that is published by the institution; the game program that we can send in Division II, and eight other permissible items, we feel that the elimination of the recruiting brochure would be a cost-saving measure.

Richard L. DeShriver (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): Speaking on behalf of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference, which has gone on record opposing this particular proposition, there is a feeling that existing legislation already controls and provides a modicum of control for the quality of publications that are being sent. The conference further feels that institutionally we should be able to provide those publications, within our limited resources, that best display and explain our institution.

Secondly, from the standpoint of the prospective student-athlete, we feel that it would be helpful to receive printed materials through the mail, rather than being deluged with telephone calls as so often

happens. Although this legislation does not speak to the question of telephone calling by coaches, we do feel that by being able to send out printed materials, this might minimize, to some extent, those calls and, therefore, help to reduce the cost of recruiting.

We urge that you carefully consider this legislation and hopefully vote it down.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I am sure that there is a description of what is a recruiting brochure. Is there a definition in the Manual? Is a pamphlet detailing sports offered, admissions information, financial aid information—is that a recruiting brochure?

Mr. Hughes: The answer would be yes, unless it's a general institutional admissions publication.

Mr. Barkey: Well you know, if you want to cut expenses, anyone in here that wants to discontinue that, can easily cut expenses and discontinue it. I don't really know the purpose of the Council bringing this kind of legislation here. In Division II, we ought to be able to send these things out. I'm not sure we're really gathering a lot of great superstar athletes, because we have a nice recruiting brochure. We can cut expenses ourselves without having it dictated to us.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-107) was defeated by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University): We will continue now with Proposal No. 114, which is a Division I-only item. No. 115 is a federation provision for Divisions I and III.

No. 116, Official Visits, Prospects and Attainment Expense, is clarifying or specifying the costs of all entertainment realized by a student host or what may be provided to a prospective student-athlete, as well as that prospective student-athlete's parents or spouse, during an official visit. There are some amendments to go along with this, and there is an interpretation to clarify the prospect's entertainment expenses. No. 116—1, Official Visits, adds into this the word "athletics." So it would read "campus athletics events." No. 116—2 changes the effective date to August 1, 1990. That would allow for the completion of this recruiting year, and then establishing the use of the rule.

No. 117, Official Visits, Student Host Entertainment Allowance, is referring to an increase that would be allowed for a Division II student host from \$10 to \$20. Nos. 118 and 119 are Division I only. No. 120 does not pertain to us now, and No. 121 is Division III only.

No. 122 is a federated provision, all divisions divided vote. This is for local sports clubs allowing the increase of mileage from 30 miles to 50 miles—a 50-mile radius—so that a student-athlete may participate with a coach from an institution in a club situation. We are increasing the mileage. No. 123 is Division III only, and No. 124 has been excluded from our voting. Nos. 125 through 130 are Division I only.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Division II Championships Committee

Mr. Hughes: Division II membership experienced a very successful year in the conduct of its championships program. More than 3,500 student-athletes competed in 11 men's and eight women's Division II championships that were conducted during the 1988-89 year. A total of 140 of the 197 Division II member institutions participated in at least one national championship competition, which is approximately 71 percent of our membership.

The governing sports committees are charged with the responsibility to develop rules and regulations used in the administration of the various championships, subject to the review of the Division II Championships Committee.

The members of the 1989 Championships Committee were: Victor A. Buccola, Western Football Conference; Rosemary Fri, University of Northern Colorado; Elwood N. Shields, Bentley College; Marjorie A. Trout, Millersville University of Pennsylvania, and myself. I served as the chair of that group.

I will attempt to summarize briefly some of more pertinent actions taken by the committee during its meetings in 1989. I will refer to those actions that affected Division II membership, including some championship items and decisions made regarding the administration of the Division II block-grant fund. Obviously, the detail on all these is in the Annual Reports, which you can pick up at the registration desk.

First, regarding host institution honorariums. During its May meeting, the committee endorsed a plan to increase the standard honorariums for host institutions of the NCAA championships from a fixed amount for preliminaries, finals and common-site competitions to varying levels of honorariums, based upon whether the event is a team or individual/team championship and based upon the number of days of competition.

Secondly, championship field sizes and participation ratios: The committee reviewed the use of participation ratios as a guideline in establishing championship field sizes and the use of desired numbers per event in the sports of track and field and swimming during its May meeting.

The policy of using participation ratios as guidelines was reaffirmed, knowing that consideration would continue to be given to such factors as the size of the event relative to other NCAA championships, unusual factors relative to the competition of a particular sport, net revenues or deficits generated by the event and the number of participants considered necessary to conduct a bona fide national championship. The committee also confirmed that NCAA championship competition should be comprised of only exceptional teams and individuals and should not have so many competitors that they become "all-comers" meets or tournaments.

Third, certification of eligibility form: In concert with Divisions I

and III Championships Committees, the committee voted to eliminate the certification-of-eligibility form effective for the 1989-1990 year. It was the opinion of the committee that the eligibility form was redundant, inasmuch as NCAA Bylaw 3.2.4 already required a member institution to certify the eligibility of its student-athletes prior to the beginning of each academic year and that Bylaw 14.1.3 requires that all student-athletes complete the Student-Athlete Statement as a condition of eligibility and notify the NCAA if their eligibility changes during the course of the year. Although the form has been eliminated, it should be noted that it is incumbent upon each institution to notify the NCAA national office prior to the selection date for each championship of any student-athlete who may have participated in regular-season competition but subsequently is deemed ineligible or unavailable for NCAA championship competition.

Fourth, automatic qualifier criteria: The championships committee supported the revision of Bylaw 31.1.4.2 regarding automatic-qualification criteria. The bylaw was revised to specify that in order to be eligible for or to retain automatic qualification a conference must have at least six institutions that are eligible for NCAA championships, rather than having simply six institutions that sponsor the sport and compete during the season.

Fifth, playing rules: During the August meeting, the committee agreed with the other championships committees and reaffirmed the intent that conduct rules must be common for all divisions, that conduct rules may not be altered either by mutual consent to something not specified in the rules or by specific mutual-consent options, and that the bylaws should not be altered to allow for differences in conduct rules among divisions.

Sixth, men's basketball: As part of the Association's overall effort to study the membership structure and enhance Division II, the committee reviewed various recommendations regarding enhancement of the Division II Men's Basketball Championship. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee submitted a proposal that was endorsed by the Division II Championships Committee in August in which the Division II tournament would receive a monetary grant from the Division I men's basketball tournament, increased television exposure, and add three-man officiating crews to the Division II championship. During the August Executive Committee meeting, the three-man officiating crews were supported. It also was decided to increase the membership of the Division II Men's Basketball Committee from six to eight. As you will note, Proposal No. 79 to be voted upon tomorrow will address this issue.

Subsequent to the August meeting, the special committee comprised of Divisions I and II representatives developed a proposal that was reviewed by the Special Committee to Review the Membership Structure. As a result of this meeting, the following has been proposed regarding the enhancement of Division II men's basketball and will be included in the report to the Council during its April meeting: That a grant, not to exceed \$3 million annually, be allocated

from the Association's share of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship to enhance the Division II championship. That the Association should eliminate the Divisions II and III block-grant programs and fully fund transportation and per diem for all participants in Divisions II and III championships. This would distribute more receipts to participants in the various championships and provide benefits for all championship programs. That live television exposure be provided for the Division II Men's Basketball Championship.

Seven, block grants: In an effort to provide funds from the block grant to the Division II membership in a more expeditious manner, the Division II championships committee decided to guarantee a \$25 per diem, which would be provided upon receipt of the team expense form in the national office. The committee estimated that sufficient funds would be available to allow for such a program, and its estimate proved correct when a surplus of \$134,000 was made available at the end of the 1988-89 championship season.

During our December meeting, the committee took the following actions regarding the Block Grant: That the \$134,000 surplus be used to provide an additional \$5 supplemental per diem to participants in the 1988-89 Division II championships, and during 1989-90 bringing the minimum to \$30 minimum per diem, and that the anticipated surplus of \$42,000 be carried over to the 1991-92 block grant. That the principles of the current block-grant program be maintained but that consideration be given to changing the term "block grant." Suggestions included "championships reserve fund" or "championship allocation." And it was agreed that these would be forwarded to the Special Committee to Review Distribution of Television Revenue. That participants in the 1989-90—the year we are in now—championships, receive a minimum of \$26 per diem, noting that the anticipated surplus will be approximately \$75,000 to \$100,000.

WAIVERS

[NOTE: The Division II business session heard petitions for waivers of Division II membership criteria from Adams State College; Chadron State College; University of Colorado, Colorado Springs; Colorado Christian University; Emporia State University; Erskine College; Fort Lewis College; Georgia College; Grand Canyon University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mesa State College; Newberry College; Oakland City College; Queens College; Shepherd College; University of South Carolina, Aiken; University of Southern Colorado; College of St. Rose, and Western State College. The petitions were approved.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[NOTE: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council was presented and approved.]

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.]

Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1990

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m. with Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Van Wie: Will the delegates take their seats, please? The Division III business session is now in order. Let me take this opportunity to welcome you to Dallas and the 84th NCAA Convention. It is my hope that you had the opportunity to see some of the sights and sounds of Texas' most progressive city. That is what I was told to say by the Chamber of Commerce, so I made that statement.

The purpose of today's business session is to conduct the business specific to Division III. It is the intent of the Division III Steering Committee that our time together will allow a healthy exchange of opinions and ideas. We are well aware of the diversity that exists within Division III. I would disagree with our executive director that there is more diversity in Division I. I think the greatest diversity is within Division III. We are hopeful that we can present a series of forums that will allow for open discussion, fair debate and appreciation of the viewpoint of others. It is my personal wish that following today's meeting, we will have a better understanding of the direction that Division III should take in the year ahead.

It should be noted that your steering committee in both its August and October meetings was responsible for planning this meeting. Please note that at this Division III business session, we will be voting on five pieces of legislation as the Division III membership. The steering committee continues to turn its attention to the major issues facing Division III rather than that of dealing mainly with minutiae. I congratulate the membership and the Division III Steering Committee.

[Note: Various announcements and introductions were made, and the roll-call voting procedure was explained.]

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Division III Steering Committee

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): As a member of the NCAA Council, I have enjoyed serving the Division III membership during the past four years. Some of these remarks may be old hat to you veterans. For people who are here for the first

or second time, there may be pieces of information that will help you understand what goes on in the inner circles of the NCAA. The Council is the body that provides direction to the Association between Conventions. Literally, it runs the Association. It consists of 46 members from the three divisions. There are 11 from Division III, 11 from Division II, 22 from Division I and two officers.

The 11 Division III members also are called the Division III Steering Committee; so when you see things and hear things in the media, in *The NCAA News* and it says the steering committee, that is what this is. It is the Division III portion of the NCAA Council. The steering committee meets four times a year, first as part of the full Council and then separately to talk about Division III matters.

For those of you who have an interest in joining the Council at some time, you should know that the Council meetings run for two and a half days at a shot, four times a year. The meetings start at 8 o'clock in the morning and usually end at 5 in the afternoon; and while the meetings are held in some very fine places like Monterey and San Diego, you don't often get to see much outside the hotel.

Steering committee areas of responsibility include but are not limited to a continuing discussion about Division III policy matters, and this includes the Division III philosophy statement that is included in the NCAA Manual. It includes sponsorship of legislation for Division III consideration and action. It includes conducting the Division III federated business session at the annual Convention, which we are here to do today. It includes reviewing and approving Administrative Committee and Interpretations Committee actions that affect the Division III membership. It includes making committee appointments authorized by the constitution and bylaws. It includes acting on requests for waivers of the Division III membership criteria.

During 1989, there were 10 such requests, with eight being approved. The committee also has the responsibility for approving awards of circumstance for the membership. In 1989, we had 11 such awards approved by the committee. In addition, the steering committee spent many hours continuing to discuss and define Division III financial aid regulations and their implementation. Initial-eligibility and academic standards were topical areas that received considerable attention during 1989 and will be brought before you for your reactions later today.

At the request of many Division III representatives, the steering committee asked the compliance services department to develop a student-athlete statement specific to Division III. This has been done and will be available for your use in 1990-91. We hope the steering committee is a reflection of you, the members. The committee welcomes comments or suggestions on how to make the Association better and more responsive to your needs. You should feel free to contact any of the Committee members or Nancy L. Mitchell, who is our staff liaison, so your input can be considered as

the Committee develops its policies for 1990 and beyond.

[Note: Members of the Division III Steering Committee were introduced.]

One of the pleasures of serving on an NCAA committee is getting to meet new and exciting people. One such person for the steering committee was Lewis Salter, president emeritus of Wabash College. He served the Association and Division III membership well before his passing and will be remembered for his dedication to preserving and strengthening the policies that govern our division. President Salter left his mark on all of us who served with him, and we are better people because of it.

Division III Championships Committee

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): The Division III Championships Committee is composed of five members—the two Executive Committee members from Division III, two Division III NCAA Council representatives and one member selected at large. The championships committee in Division III is responsible to the Executive Committee and reports to it. We meet three times a year, in May, August and December, prior to the Executive Committee meeting. Because of the volume of business and the increase of it in this past year, it has been voted that the May and the August meetings be increased to a day and a half to offer us more time for deliberation.

The charge to the committee and the responsibilities are: (1) to make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding the allocation of the Executive Committee-approved subsidy for the conduct of the Division III championships block grant; (2) to supervise the qualification and/or the selection procedures for these championship events; (3) to maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the area of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport, with the Executive Committee having the final authority; (4) to review the recommendations from sports committees regarding the administration of our championships; (5) to process other issues related to the administration of the events, and (6) to act for the Executive Committee as the final authority regarding championships matters in Division III that are subject to appeal to the Executive Committee.

Concerning financial allocations for this past year, it recently has been published, and we have received checks, that a \$25 per diem was allocated and distributed retroactively in 1988-89 to Division III championship participants. A projected surplus of \$47,000 has been carried over to the 1989-90 budget. We are happy to report that. We have recommended that the 1990-91 budget cover the full cost of transportation and per diem for all participants in Division III championships and that it appear as a line item in that budget. The recommendation was agreed to in principle by the Executive Committee, but any such matters are now referred to the Special Committee to Review Distribution of Television Revenues.

Obviously, there is great interest in our committee about this distribution of revenues for Division III. With new dollars, we are hoping for the opportunity in this year and coming years for new thinking in ways to return revenue to the institutions, to be able to fully sponsor the transportation and travel costs of our student-athletes while still showing constraint and prudence with the allocations of these funds.

Most of our business agenda on the championships committee is dealing directly with the governing sports bodies and the other championship committees. We deal with their reports and the recommendations, recognizing that the structure of our committee makes it somewhat difficult to have face-to-face representation with each of the 23 chairs that we deal with.

The championships committees are charged by the Executive Committee to exercise fiscal responsibility and limit participation to championship-caliber competitors. When evaluating requests for bracket expansion and other requests, it sometimes becomes an adversarial role for the championships committees in dealing with each of the sports groups. This next year, we will be trying to delegate more responsibility to the individual championships committees members in dealing with individual sports and dealing with sports chairs on an individual basis so that we can better educate our other members at meetings and report more directly the requests and the rationale for requests.

We will be requesting more detailed information and trying to standardize the forms for any bracket-expansion requests so each group is dealing with the same types of information across the whole breadth of our sports opportunities. On any significant recommendation or major issue, we now will have the opportunity to have in person each of the chairs at our meetings and be able to explain in a more systematic way the rationale for their requests. I think that in the future, this will provide more visibility for each of the chairs and better rationale for each of the discussions.

The makeup of sports committees has been a topic of conversation within the membership, within each of your regions, as to how to get onto these committees that are making decisions whether your schools and your teams get into championships. I think the makeup of the committees has been of prime concern of the championships committees as to how to standardize a systematic way of rotation and length of terms. There is a study for a three-year term for each of those committees and a rotation system within each of those groups regionally as well as nationally. We want to make sure that there is appropriate representation of conferences and independents, representing a broad cross-section within each of your regions able to transmit proper information with you—championships information as far as a selection of participants and individuals within your group. So that has been a real topic of interest, and I think this will help to, again, open up the lines of communication with the membership, to have more representation from differ-

ent forums and different opportunities for people so there is not the stigma that the same people are making the same decisions every year and they never rotate off, so I think that will help tremendously.

One of the chief topics in each group, naturally, is bracket expansion. Not many of the sports groups have come forward and offered to cut their championships. More in line is how many more teams can we get with all this new money, how many more individuals can go to championship meets. That is, obviously, a very difficult type of decision to make; and we, again, would like to have the same kind of broad information across each of the sports groups so it is easier to rationalize the requests on a sport-by-sport basis. We tried to develop some general criteria for all the championships by which the quality of the competition could be evaluated relative to the bracket-expansion requests so that we are consistent with the charge from the Executive Committee to provide a real quality championship and not an all-comers meet with too many teams that do not make it a real strong Division III championship event. One of the real problems, again, is the ratio system, and we would like to have more consistency in applying the ratios than in the past. Some groups will try to apply the ratios in a more systematic manner, while others will try to hide the fact that their ratio is a little off from the others. So, we would like to make the ratio mean something; and the Executive Committee reaffirmed the policy of using these participation ratios as guidelines in establishing championship field size, noting that: (1) consideration be given to such facts as the size of each event relative to other NCAA championships; (2) unusual factors relative to the quality of competition in a particular sport; (3) net revenues or deficits generated by those sports, and (4) number of participants considered necessary to conduct bonafide national championship competition. We feel these are guidelines that are important, and we would like to have a ratio that is consistent sport by sport, depending on these factors.

The last area that we have addressed, among the many different issues within our group, is the choosing of sites. Those of you who have hosted NCAA championship events know fully well the tremendous impact upon your campus, your staff—the burden of responsibility that the NCAA requires for such events. We would like to make it more attractive so that we can guarantee quality sites that are available region by region, and so that each of the committees has a real choice based on the best quality sites for our athletes. To do that, we have increased the revenues and the benefits to the institution, knowing full well that for the institutions that go the extra mile, it costs a good amount of money to host these championships. We would like to distribute it more evenly so that each of the regions in the country in some systematic way, despite the financial implications, has the opportunity on a rotating-basis formula to conduct a national championship in Division III. This would provide more visibility within your region for Division III

championships, and I think this is one thing that we will be addressing in our meeting.

These are some of the considerations that the Division III Championships Committee discussed this year. There are many, many issues that we have to address to be able to be more equitable in opening up the communication and trying to understand the various needs of the sports groups and the governing sports bodies. I think, again with our departing chair's leadership, we have done an outstanding job in opening up these lines.

Executive Committee

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): There may be some overlap with the championships committee report, or you may hear it in somewhat a different way, because we work so closely together. The NCAA Executive Committee meets three times a year as a body, in May, August and December. The committee has responsibility for transacting the administrative affairs of the NCAA, including the adoption and management of budgets, income, expenditures and audits. The Executive Committee also is officially responsible for conducting all NCAA championships and tournaments.

The three NCAA divisional championships committees report and recommend to the Executive Committee, as you have heard, for final approval of policies. The Executive Committee formally employs and supervises the NCAA executive director and with Dick Schultz oversees all NCAA staff personnel policies.

Important Executive Committee actions taken over the past year include first in the area of finance and budget: We approved the current 1989-90 operating budget at \$89.7 million. That is an increase of nine percent from last year's 1988-89 budget of \$82 million. The fiscal year for the NCAA ends August 31st; and for the 1988-89 year just completed, actual revenues were seven percent over budget at \$87.8 million, which provided a surplus of almost \$3 million over actual expenses.

Division III championships expended approximately \$2.3 million of the total NCAA expense budget of \$84.9 million. Division III block-grant expenditures were approximately \$1.8 million, of which about two-thirds covered team and individual travel and one-third was the \$25 per diem allotted just last month retroactive for the second year in a row to all Division III championship participants. You should have received your per diem checks by late December.

Looking ahead, Division III NCAA championship certainly stands to benefit, along with just about everyone else, from the new CBS-NCAA television contract, which is effective with the 1991 Division I Men's Basketball Championship. As you have heard, the contract calls for \$1 billion for television rights over seven years for some 17 NCAA championships, 10 more than currently are televised. Division I men's basketball is, of course, the dominant interest, with average annual rights fees increasing in 1991 to \$143 mil-

lion annually from the current \$55.3 million annual fee.

With this almost threefold increase in television rights fees, it is hoped and anticipated that Division III championships transportation and per diem will be funded fully for all participants whether we continue with a line-budgeted block-grant concept or a different financial format. For the current year, 1989-90, the Division III block grant was budgeted adequately at approximately this year's level, including the \$25 retroactive per diem.

As you have heard, during 1990 we will be working to develop more specific parameters and options for what Division III championships full funding should be. For example, we will look carefully at the 400-mile nonflying limit and the funding of coaches in individual sports as well as the appropriate championships participation ratios and per diem levels. Probably at least \$40 for the two-year versus the two-year \$25 level that you have been receiving. All Division III recommendations for 1990-91 in this regard will be referred to the Special Committee reviewing the Distribution of Television Revenue for the new CBS television contract.

Other Executive Committee actions of particular interest to this group include the newly established NCAA Foundation, which hired its executive director, Robert Khayat, on July 1. He was vice-chancellor for university relations and professor of law at the University of Mississippi. He was also a former kicker with the Washington Redskins. The NCAA Foundation objectives include the structuring of a relatively small and effective 10- to 12-person cornerstone group of directors and the raising of \$50 million. The cornerstone group will include Executive Director Dick Schultz and the two NCAA senior officers.

Secondly, the NCAA Executive Committee authorized funding for one two-day meeting for the Faculty Athletic Representative Association to review academic impact and proposed legislation and to discuss current issues. The meeting took place last summer.

Third, honorariums for host institutions for NCAA championships were increased effective this current 1989-90 academic year. Officiating improvement programs were carefully reviewed, and it was decided to continue on a permanent basis the pilot programs in men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse. Effective this year, we will establish pilot programs for officiating improvement in baseball and wrestling. Funding budgets were approved for all four programs.

In NCAA drug testing and the application of ineligibility sanctions, the Executive Committee agreed that the issue of the application of ineligibility sanctions must be dealt with legislatively by this 1990 Convention. We voted to forward to this Convention three alternatives, which are, as you know, Proposal Nos. 52, 53 and 54. You will note that year-round drug testing is proposed only for Division I football for the first two years, with testing only for anabolic steroids, diuretics and specimen manipulators.

To some, the most appealing decision by the Executive Commit-

tee was the elimination this year of the certification-of-eligibility/availability form, which was used formerly for NCAA championships. It still is incumbent upon institutions to notify the NCAA national office prior to championship selection of any student-athlete eligible for regular season but ineligible for championship competition.

Finally and certainly not least, I want to recognize and applaud, as others have done, the leadership of Al Van Wie, our outgoing Division III vice-president. You have been a leader, in my view, of wisdom, tenacity and courage. I speak for your Executive Committee colleagues and for Division III in general in thanking you for your contributions and in gratitude for your friendship and your exceptional personal qualities. You will be missed a great deal, Al.

Presidents Commission

William J. Byron (Catholic University): To give you the tone of what we have been about since this Presidents Commission was set up six years ago, the kind of one-liner that people use to describe what this initiative is all about is that it is a group of presidents trying to regain control of intercollegiate athletics from the coaches and the athletic directors. So, with that compliment to all of you who are coaches and athletic directors, I will continue to give you the explanation of what this is about by reminding some of you who may have heard Mike Heyman, the now outgoing chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, who as an undergraduate played basketball at Dartmouth—and Mike is about 6-5, I guess—and at one of these meetings, he proposed the elimination of all postseason tournament play in Division I. He said to me later, "I have a Division III mind and a Division I body."

The theme that has been running through this Presidents Commission since it was initiated could be caught in one word, integrity. There is a genuine concern among members of the Commission that it must try to regain, quite frankly, and restore integrity in intercollegiate sports. If you were to bring it down to one issue—what really is of concern to the Presidents Commission, the full Commission as it met yesterday—it would be a response to the finding in the AIR study that student-athletes are just suffering too many time pressures. They feel under the gun. They feel pressured on time; and if any of us sits down and does the arithmetic of the situation, when you look at the number of hours in practice and training and competition against hours in class, it is pretty simple to come to the conclusion that we are pressing them too much. So, the major concern of the full Presidents Commission going into this Convention, I would say, rests on Proposition 30. The members recognize that that one is a bit on the fragile side and is going to need a lot of support from the floor.

When we broke out relatively briefly yesterday for our Division III meeting, we focused on two issues that will be discussed later in this forum. I will just mention them and not get into much detail. One was the length of the basketball season, and I will explain that

the consensus that we had was to roll it back to the first Monday after Thanksgiving (rather than December 1) and, thus, get a couple of games in before Christmas and lighten up on the pressure of the schedule in February and March. The other issue dealt with graduation rates, and we will discuss that later today.

One issue on our legislative agenda that came under discussion was Proposition 51 about nonathletics achievement awards. Our recommendation is going to be that the issue be deferred so that it can be clarified and a number of the issues that we discussed yesterday could be picked up.

I would like to just give you a couple of what I would call over-the-horizon issues that the Presidents Commission is dealing with. The first and, in my view, the most important is a proposed certification program. Right now, it is a Division I issue; but it is something that has been on the agenda in the discussion mode in the Presidents Commission for a couple of years, whether you can fold athletics more explicitly under your regional accreditation, whether it is worth having a specific accreditation, now called certification program, run by the NCAA to focus on the programs. Dick Schultz gave us just yesterday a fairly lengthy memorandum or study paper indicating that this is moving along. I would like to report to you what the proposed areas of certification are. In other words, the Division I program in this scenario will be visited by a certifying team and will be examined under the headings of the mission and purpose not just, of course, of the university, but of the athletics department or departments or programs within the university.

Second would be governance and administrative issues as they apply to athletics. Third, the academic issues. Fourth, financial issues, and I will pause to say that this one dropped in toward maybe the fourth quarter of the discussion of all issues. In my view, it is crucial that there be some kind of an examination of the financial issues; and in the perspective of public relations, this one is absolutely essential. This section will research the policies, procedures and controls governing the sources and expenditures of the athletics department as they compare with other departments. So finances will be directly under scrutiny. The fifth area of certification is the conduct of student-athletes and coaches, the conduct both in competition and off court, off field. Finally, the commitment of the institution to rules compliance.

Another over-the-horizon issue was stated just yesterday, and in response to this consideration, a task force will be appointed to examine the compensation of athletics personnel, the compensation from the institution and how that compensation is supplemented. Those of you who work in Division III know that is not a major issue in our division, but it is a window through which the public looks at intercollegiate athletics. It will be examined by a task force to be appointed by Martin Massengale; and that task force, as I understand it now, will be made up exclusively of members of the Presidents Commission.

My final note is that the Commission, our subcommittee—the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission—will be chaired now by David Warren, the president of Ohio Wesleyan University.

Nominating Committee

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council and the Division III vice-president was presented and approved.]

DIVISION III FORUM

Length of Seasons

Mr. Van Wie: From the cards and letters and phone calls that many members of the steering committee have received during the past year, one of the major questions coming from the membership is the question of length of season, especially as it deals with the 21-week rule. We have asked John Harvey, athletics director at Carnegie-Mellon University, to chair a forum on this particular topic. John will introduce the panel and following their presentations will be willing to answer questions or discussions from the floor.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie-Mellon University): Thank you, Al. I am happy to have the opportunity to participate in a discussion on such an important issue. As we have heard already this morning and have heard for the past couple days, this issue represents a lot of things to us. I am sure we all can agree that the playing season, the length of the playing season, also the practice season has a lot of important connections in this Convention. It underlies, of course, specifically the decision we will make later on Proposal 30, as you have heard. As I see it, it is a currently critical issue that also represents many more things and has other manifestations in other parts of our programs.

As we look through all sections of it, it is intended on a progressive basis to be extended to other sports in the future. If Division III desires to do so, in 1991 and 1992, there will be a rolling effect of this. It has also grown into one of the important issues for several reasons historically, I think. Those of you who have been around the NCAA for quite a while know that it has been an issue or been discussed in years past. Now we see through Proposal 30 that it is being brought to a head, brought to the climax, we might say, in the consideration of that whole issue through this year. I know that in the past I have talked to other athletics directors and many have thought about proposals, have thought about suggesting this and suggesting that. Now we see through the efforts of the Presidents Commission that we have it right here in front of us, represented through Proposal 30. There are a lot of educational implications, too, as you know—the ability to teach your sport, teach a sport for longer than a limited time during the academic year. There is also the academic issue of specialization. How much specialization or concentration should we allow? How much flexibility should we

allow?

The question of how many weeks or months we allow for each sport clearly is tied into some practical considerations. I am sure that we athletics directors all think about those first. We think about the playing facilities that we have. We think about the staff that we have, the trainers, the coaches, the ability of coaches perhaps to participate in two seasons. There are a lot of practical considerations that come to our mind first; but as we have heard through the Presidents Commission, it represents something much broader than these practical and somewhat provincial considerations that we know are important to us as well.

The Presidents Commission has made some real efforts in the last couple of years; and I see this proposal, Proposal 30, and this whole issue of length of playing seasons as a test case here at this Convention for the validity of the commission's efforts, the viability of what we are trying to do and what we have been trying to do. So while we discuss today this particular issue, I hope that we won't get narrowed down to too many practical considerations but think of the broadest implications of this whole issue that has been developing for so many years.

We have two excellent spokespersons to stand up today and speak on this issue, one on either side of the issue. Speaking first will be Jane Betts, the associate athletics director at MIT. As you know, MIT has long conducted programs of very high integrity based on very viable and very strong educational principles.

Jane Betts (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I would like to begin by telling you a story about three student-athletes who were sentenced to be executed at the guillotine. The first student-athlete came into the execution chamber, and he took his place at the guillotine. He looked up at the executioner, and he said, "Mr. Executioner, I don't want to die." He said, "I am a student-athlete at Indiana University. I play Hoosier basketball for Coach Bob Knight. I know that when I graduate, I am going to be drafted, taken to the Celtics in the NBA, replace Larry Bird when he retires. I don't want to die." But the executioner released the guillotine, the knife dropped, and it stopped right here (just above the neck). He got up and he walked away, and the second student-athlete came into the chamber. He took his place at the guillotine, and he looked up at the executioner and said, "Mr. Executioner, I don't want to die." He said, "I am a football player at Auburn, and I played on that team this fall that defeated Alabama for the first time at Auburn. I know I am going to be a first-round draft choice in the NFL. I am going to make such a difference in professional sports. Please don't let me die." But the executioner released the guillotine, the knife dropped, and it stopped right here. He got up and walked away, and he was happy.

The third student-athlete came in. This student-athlete was from MIT, and she played on the women's volleyball team that competed in the NCAA Division III championship this year. She took

her place at the guillotine like the other two; but this time, she looked up at the apparatus and then she looked at the executioner and said, "Mr. Executioner, if you would just change that fulcrum so that first-class lever was a third-class lever, this thing would work."

At MIT, we espouse the NCAA Division III philosophical statement, which indicates that the university places the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience by strengthening the integration of programs in athletics with developmental objectives. The statement also directs institutions in Division III to place special importance on participants by encouraging participation. It further states that athletes should not be denied the rights and opportunities that would be available to them as nonathletes.

I find our current Division III regulation, which restricts the opportunity for individual athletes to receive instruction from members of the coaching staff, to be in direct conflict with the philosophical basis of our division. How can we be encouraging participation in athletics while at the very same time restricting our athletes to 21 or 26 weeks of competition and practice? How can we say that Division III athletes receive the same treatment as nonathletes when a nonathlete can work out with a coach every day if he or she so chooses? It seems that restrictions on how and/or when student-athletes train in Division III should simply be a matter of institutional autonomy.

Surely, our CEOs and boards of trustees have confidence in us as athletics administrators to make the right decisions in managing our athletics programs so that they are in concert with the educational mission of our institutions. I keep asking myself why do we have this 21-week rule. The best I can ascertain is that it is an attempt to achieve some kind of competitive equity within the division. If in order to achieve competitive equity we choose to sacrifice opportunities for learning, I say this is foolish.

Our institutions continue to maintain autonomy in selecting our coaching staffs. Some of us have programs with full-time coaches. Some have part-time coaches. Some have assistant coaches. Some have no assistants at all. There is great diversity among us in the kinds of facilities that our institutions provide for athletics competition. Some of us have the opportunity to practice and play tennis indoors, while others run their entire tennis programs out-of-doors. Some schools have artificial turf fields while others play football, soccer and field hockey on patches of mud and weeds.

Decisions on who will coach and where we will play rightfully belong to our institutions. Deciding when students can learn physics, history or chemistry in lectures, laboratories or help sessions, likewise, belongs to the students and the professors involved. The right to decide when student-athletes individually can learn more about their sports from their coaches should be the combined privilege of the athletics administration, the student-athlete and the coach.

As a means of illustrating this point, let me share a portion of a letter written by a student-athlete at MIT who started her intercollegiate athletics career before we adopted the 21-week rule. She writes, "I have been a member of the women's tennis team for almost four years. As a freshman, I did not have the technical skill necessary to play competitively against other Division III schools. Throughout the past four years, my technical skills have improved a great deal. I attribute this to the private lessons that coach Rohrer made available to me during the off-season. These lessons gave her the opportunity to help me improve a particular stroke that was lacking in my game. I also witnessed this improvement in many other players who did not have good technical skills upon entering MIT. Coach Rohrer has been able to help us improve as tennis players both in and out of season.

"The NCAA 21-week rule now prevents members of the team from getting coaching off-season, coaching that is essential if we are to improve as much as we can. It is unfortunate that new members of the team do not have the opportunity to improve that I once had. In conclusion, I would like to suggest that the basis of and the potential effects of the rule be reconsidered. Sincerely, Katherine Gianetti."

I challenge the members of Division III to consider the following questions. Are we responding to the wants and the needs of our students who participate in our Division III intercollegiate athletics program? Is it now necessary for the members of Division III to legislate competitive equity? And, finally, should we rescind the 21-week rule, or should we change our Division III philosophy? Thank you.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie-Mellon University): Thank you, Jane. Speaking on the other side of the issue, Curt Tong, the athletics director at Pomona-Pitzer Colleges.

Curtis W. Tong (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I think the best aspect of being in this position today as opposed to being where you are is the opportunity to look down and see some of my former and present heroes. My former articulation coach, Peter Gooding, is here. My style leader, Bob Hatch, is here. My hair stylist, Porter Miller, is here. I am not going to ask any of them to stand because it would be embarrassing; but for those of you who know them, you will understand the context in which I say that.

I am glad that we were introduced today as a forum as opposed to a panel. A panel, as you know, is a group of experts, and a forum just involves a group of people who have opinions. I, like you, have opinions; and it is my call today to express mine, which differ somewhat from Jane's. But I think that the bottom line is that we both really want the same thing for Division III. In thinking about the subject of length of seasons, I was reminded of the gentleman in the first-floor apartment who was trying very hard to go to sleep one night; and as he lay there in bed, he heard a shoe drop from the flat up above. For the rest of the night, he tossed and turned and waited for

the other shoe to drop. I think the whole matter of length of seasons is an issue in which we in Division III are waiting for the other shoe to drop, and I think that Father Byron this morning expressed that in the view of the Presidents Commission, at least. It is time for the other shoe to drop. It seems as though we sit these days not satisfied with the present patterns of season lengths and the complexity of the 21-week rule and waiting for the other shoe to fall with a better plan. I think that is what we are all about here at this Convention: to try to develop a better plan.

It will not be my function today to pass strict judgments on what is right or wrong regarding the proper length of playing seasons. That is not to suggest that I have not some very definite opinions on the subject, but I would like to offer some perspectives by which to measure our decisions. This Convention offers some very contrasting legislative proposals to test our thinking on the future direction of Division III sports programs relative to the length of seasons. I think there are well-meaning people on both ends, and I have heard both arguments. It is very hard to argue against the educational concepts of both, but I think we all understand that the nature of sports sometimes dictates that we need as administrators to take actions that bring into line some of the abuses that have occurred, even in Division III.

Proposal No. 30, for example, deals with shortening the number of basketball games and the length of season. That contrasts tremendously from Proposal No. 103, which in effect, extends the tennis season. In that both of these sports have been my own coaching specialty areas during my professional life, I naturally have strong feelings about the directions for both and how they can be conducted. But as we weigh these pieces of legislation as objectively as we can, allow me first to approach the concerns about length of seasons from a philosophical vantage point.

I see in the audience today some former students of Delbert Oberhoff at Ohio State University, and I am sure those who recall his classes remember well the admonishments he used to give all of us regarding philosophy. What he suggested was, don't develop procedures without establishing policies, and don't establish policies without falling back on a philosophical base. In other words, what you believe. As we look at the question of what is too long or what is too short in terms of the length of seasons, let us reflect a little bit on the dictates of Division III philosophy.

I think that most of us would agree that our divisional philosophy speaks pointedly to a number of things. One is an experience for the students at our institutions that provides for coaches who are both teachers and advisers, not merely game strategists and technicians. It points to an opportunity for a broad education, and I underline broad; to pursue a variety of learning experiences, which includes exposure to various fields of study, certainly athletics participation, involvement in music, theater and other cultural opportunities, overseas study and the like. This is particularly pertinent

to Division III. It points to the freeing of time to explore other educational pursuits, especially after the competitive sports seasons have been terminated.

Yesterday, Dick Schultz in his remarks pointedly challenged this Convention toward curtailments in season lengths and in practice times and in pressures that these pose for students. It points to an experience that encourages mixing and meeting, living with, studying with a broad range of students from a variety of backgrounds. Our philosophy, I think, speaks, also, to equal treatment of all students in financial aid, housing, meals, employment opportunities and so forth. It also points to the provision of a broad range of sports offerings at varying levels, all available to students for participation's sake, not for promotion, not for revenue, but fairly financed through the general budget of the college and administered to ensure equal opportunities for play regardless of gender.

If these, indeed, are the goals to which Division III is committed, then what they are suggesting is that we mold our athletics programs to fit the educational goals of our institutions and to construct our sport schedules to reflect that commitment. My sense is that for that to happen, we need to take a look at several things, and one is the excessive weekday scheduling, especially when it means missed class time. We need to look hard at the overlap of seasons. Excessive overlap in traditional seasons only discourages students from dual-sports experiences; and golly knows, we rely on students to sometimes play more than one sport.

Excessive overlap also precludes our ability to use coaches in other sports. It encourages specialization, the necessity to hire more coaches or reduce sports offerings, not options we relish in Division III. John Harvey pointed out some of the practical things like the pressure that all of this brings—overlap brings on some of the support services, particularly in the area of training. There is a tendency sometimes to get caught up in our work, forget philosophical guidelines, in search of more expedient or self-serving goals, spending our time and energy on program promotion, as an example. Managing programs as mini-Division I programs so as to use them as stepping stones in jobs at big-time institutions is a good example. This encourages a high focus of time spent on recruitment, revenue production and other excesses—less on teaching and advising.

Division III, I think most of us would concur, should not be an adventure in commercial athletics or merely a smaller Division I. Our programs are aimed not only at being strictly amateur, but they need to promote enjoyment and learning. They need to promote striving to win, but not as an end-all. I think they must reflect our institutions as places of learning. I think they need to move away from off-campus recruitment and the often unfair pressure that that brings to bear on prospective students. I think we need to get away from the notion that national championships dictate the caliber, the number of contests and the length of seasons for many

of our sports; and I think that we all need to ascertain that our gyms, our pools, our fields are really laboratories for learning, not only for the values inherent in physical competition, but also the intangible values that only sports can offer to our students.

In looking more closely at the issue of length of seasons, it is necessary, I think, to study each sport separately, then try to provide for each a meaningful season within the framework of Division III philosophy. For too long, we have allowed circumstances other than institutional goals and division philosophy to dictate the lengths of seasons. In some cases, for example, pressure from coaches' organizations or coaches themselves have created unsanctioned growth of schedules. Sometimes, regional pressures enter into it. Hockey in New England, baseball in the Sunbelt have led to expansion in those sports; and even climate has been used as a rationale for shorter or longer seasons.

What I would prefer to see would be the development of a plan to bring closer national uniformity to season lengths, with student needs, institutional goals and divisional philosophy as the primary considerations in determining length of seasons. We have drifted away from these principles, and continual escalation has raised serious questions about the direction of athletics at our colleges. It is time to reflect on what has been happening and put objectivity and reason into our determinations as to what is appropriate in lengths of seasons for Division III institutions.

In our quest to deal with these concerns, we have in recent years entered into compromise-type legislation like the 21-week rule, which has created some confusion on what the lengths of seasons really are. But little of recent legislation has answered the philosophical concerns which seem to be begging to be addressed. This Convention, under the lead of the Presidents Commission, seems ready to do just that. I would hope that as we address the length-of-season issues before us, that our decisions not be determined by what coaches' committees have recommended or what Division I and Division II folks are doing. Rather, let us decide what is best for us based on the goals of our institutions and the unique beliefs of our division. If I am reading these correctly, what I am hearing is that it is time to pull back. We have developed to the point of excess, to the point where we are not living by our tenets, and it is, frankly, uncomfortable.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie-Mellon University): Thank you very much, Curt. As we have heard, there are some very strong educational arguments on either side of this issue; and I think we all do have and should have opinions on this issue. As I say, they are all going to be brought to a head soon. I would like to now entertain any comments or questions that any of you members may have. There are enough microphones, and I would urge you to step forward and make your comments. As Curt said, this is a forum, so feel free to come forward and make your comments or ask the panelists any questions you may have. Do we have anybody with questions?

Julie Zuraw (Bryn Mawr College): I have not a question, but a comment. I am a student-athlete. I am a student at Bryn Mawr College and one of the Division III members on the newly formed Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We are trying to begin to reach out to the many, many, many student-athletes that we represent. At this point, we are starting to see into that population. What we can offer is our own opinions and a little bit of what we hear from other athletes. On the issue of playing seasons, I think very generally what I have heard from athletes in the Philadelphia area especially and on the committee here is that in the sports at least of volleyball, basketball, football and soccer people are very satisfied with the length as it is. The students I talked to in Philadelphia were very much against shortening the season. In a very general way, they simply felt they wanted to play.

However, in our discussions, when we reached the issue of a strain on a small college's resource when you are dealing with overlapping seasons and a small staff and facilities, our discussion kind of hit a wall, and we realized that it was not as simple as simply wanting to play and the length being good. So generally, I think the students I have talked to feel that they are capable or want to be capable of handling the length of the season and their academic commitment. Very honestly, we do realize that there are considerations for the athletics department and the institution that may be larger.

John Zinda (Claremont-McKenna-Harvey-Mudd-Scripps Colleges): I think the issue of a limit on playing seasons and the idea expressed in No. 103 have a relationship that has kind of been, in my heart, something that has changed dramatically as the years have gone on. Our conference worked for 25 years with the principle of a limited playing season and one-on-one coaching. When the 21-week rule came in, it had a major impact in our conference and our relationship with our student-athletes. It seems ridiculous today that you can have a 21-week playing and practice football season in Division III. By interpretation, you could play and practice—if the coaching and school administration wanted to let you do that—21 weeks. That seems ludicrous. Any football coach, including myself, would recognize that to have a football team out there for 21 weeks playing 11 games, spread them out over the whole course of whenever you can find a game, would be ridiculous.

In the sport of tennis, we have a situation that allows one-on-one coaching. The Women's Basketball Coaches Association, Division III, made a request to allow one-on-one coaching for women's basketball teams. In our conference, we allowed everybody to coach one on one, except for basketball, which seemed to be highly unfair. I think the women pointed that out in their attempt to change the legislation before this group.

Last year, our conference sponsored legislation trying to attempt to do that, and it was defeated. It seems to me that as a professor, a tenured professor, at an institution, I should be treated like a fac-

ulty member anyplace else on our campus. We have made crooks out of all of us in Division III.

It seems as a football coach that if my quarterback comes in my office and I tell him he can only talk about fishing, hunting, girls, whatever else is on his mind except football, it is almost inconceivable. When you take it down to every single sport, it seems like we need to legislate where we can be philosophical and believe in what we are doing. The other one that falls into this philosophical thing is we cannot talk to financial aid officers. All of these things are legislative pieces of information that simply as an athletics director become impossible to manage. I think in Division III, I would like to see the steering committee take us out of Division I and put us in Division III where we can all function.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): I would like to speak on Proposal No. 30. It does deal with playing and practice seasons. The issue that I wish to raise appears under Part F, dealing with the starting of practice times for basketball and the first date, and I—as an individual who has a dual capacity as a head varsity basketball coach and athletics director—have some concerns with the first date. I don't have very much concern in terms of the November 1st starting date as opposed to the traditional October 15. Many of my colleagues in New England have a starting date of November 1st; and certainly, their teams are well prepared by the time the first contest comes about. The fact that we have chosen December 1 as a starting date puts a great deal of pressure in terms of scheduling what will become, obviously, 25 games into a schedule that is going to be impacted by the term break and with final examinations.

If December 1st is the starting date and your examinations begin the very next week, you have one week in order to compact, if you want, as many games as possible. Then final examinations are upon us, and then our student-athletes return home, where I am certain that most of them will be working in order to raise tuition dollars for the second semester. If your classes do not resume until January 22, in order to fulfill your 25-game commitment, you are going to have a great deal of difficulty in allowing student-athletes to play during the week and a limited number of weekend opportunities.

Father Byron mentioned that there was discussion of bringing the beginning of the practice session back to the Monday after Thanksgiving. If you look at your 1990 calendar and then your 1991 calendar, you will see that there is a great juxtaposition in terms of when that date falls. Certainly, the aspect of having the opportunity to play the weekend after Thanksgiving in most years will allow you some weekend contests. I feel that our student-athletes in the sport of basketball would much prefer to be competing against another institution's players rather than practicing in a situation against their own teammates who all too well know the plays that are coming up. It has become at that particular point too

repetitive. The November 1st starting date, no difficulty at all. But the December 1st is going to present us some real problems in terms of scheduling and taking students away from classes. Thank you.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie-Mellon University): I would like to point out one thing, a personal opinion on this. It has been brought up in a number of discussions that the November 1st date for starting practices is the critical—the more important—consideration. The date of the first game, if there were adjustments, as suggested by Father Byron, made in that, it might accommodate a great many interests such as Jim Nelson suggested. Father Byron, would you like to comment again on those adjustments?

Rev. William J. Byron (Catholic University): This is the point I alluded to earlier. I can give you in a bit more detail what the spirit and the substance of the discussion was in the Presidents Commission. We feel that Proposal No. 30 is fragile going into this Convention, and we would like not to add to the fragility by tinkering. So, the Presidents Commission had the feeling that we should vote for it as it is with the December 1 date, but an initiative from the Presidents Commission would be to survey your opinion, just as the opinion that was expressed today, with which we would entirely agree, so that we could offer to the Convention a year from now an amendment that would bring it back either, as we were saying yesterday, to the Monday after Thanksgiving or as was just argued a moment ago and persuasively, I think, for the weekend before Thanksgiving.

We just don't want to get into that kind of surgery right now because of what we perceive to be the fragility of the whole proposition. President Roger Martin of Moravian College in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, will remain on the Presidents Commission. I leave. Roger, would you stand? He is the one who brought it up and who, I think, will make sure that David Warren and the others stay on this so we can come back a year from now and get the adjustment that will satisfy all the needs after the needs are examined carefully.

The point in the Presidents Commission that I found most persuasive was simply this, by permitting ourselves to have two or three additional games before Christmas by one or another of these proposed adjustments, we will eliminate in the second semester two or three weeks where you would have three games rather than two and, thus, complicate the absence from class and compound the travel time. So that by a minor adjustment along the lines that we have just been discussing, we—on good academic grounds—can preserve the commitment that we have to class attendance and to the academics in the second semester. That is the relationship that we sought.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I have a number of thoughts, but I will try to keep it very short. First of all, in Division III, in New England in particular, I doubt that we miss very much class time traveling. I know that at my institution we don't, and

most of my colleagues in New England don't miss much class time. So, I don't know how big an issue that really is. It may be in other sectors if there is extensive travel, but that is not a problem in the Northeast, certainly. That is not the point of my comment, though.

As I have listened, and I listened to both speakers, who spoke very well to the issue, I guess my concern is we are, in fact, modeling ourselves after Division I. I think the missed-class-time issue is one of those issues. We do not, in fact, miss a lot of class time in most of our sports, and I am wondering—and I guess thinking, too, what Dick Schultz said, to think about things radically, to change things radically—if our steering committee cannot, in fact, take us out of the model that Division I has created. Because, I think Division III is considerably different. It seems to me that the limitations that we have put on, a 21-week playing season, I don't think that impacts most of us.

We formalize something that I don't know and do not necessarily feel had to be formalized. We have a very successful athletics program. Yet, during the season, one of the regulations we have in our Manual is that during class time, practice for a team is limited to two hours a day. Seems very reasonable. Coaches should be able to do their jobs. Yet, I find it unconscionable that a tennis coach cannot meet with a player to help out a player, or a golf coach or a basketball coach, for that matter, who wants to speak to a player, cannot do so. I think we are missing something.

I think we have to, as one of the earlier speakers said, look at our facilities and consider them laboratories as opposed to playing fields and arenas. I would ask the Division III Steering Committee to look seriously at taking us away from the Division I model and stop modeling our legislation after Division I. I think it is a major error that we have made, and we have all suffered to varying degrees. Thank you.

John M. Schael (Washington University): My remarks really are associated with basketball. I think the current legislation that we have works very well. I don't think there is any evidence of abuse in Division III, and there is really no evidence to warrant a change at this time. I think several years ago we entered with good faith into the 21-week playing season. Today, we are going to talk about Proposition 30, and Proposition 30 is before Division III basically because of the American Institutes for Research project. The data, which clearly indicates the pressure of time on student-athletes, deals exclusively with Division I. Not one Division III athlete was interviewed; and yet, we are going to talk about modifying the playing seasons for Division III student-athletes.

If there are problems that exist, do we need national legislation to change? Can it not be better handled within one's own conference? Can the issue not be better handled by the individual institutions? When we talk about having a first contest in basketball played on the Monday after Thanksgiving, what do we do with the young people who are on campus when there are no classes? They

have an opportunity to play the game, say, the Friday before or during the Thanksgiving break where there are no time pressures on those young people who are participating. I would hope that we don't adopt 30, but I certainly know that there will be a lot of good discussion on it.

Joy Hager (Berea College): I think that we need to leave the playing dates and the starting of the season and practice dates as they are. It seems to me that if the Presidents Commission wants to have us vote for something in principle, that is the way it should have been presented rather than giving us now specific dates, specific things to vote on and saying we will change that later when we find out exactly what you want. I do not think we should be voting something in and saying we will fix it later. It seems to me this is not the best way to approach this. Thank you.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): Whereas I believe in institutional autonomy and speaking specifically as an athletics director, it is also apparent that there are a great deal of intrinsic and internal pressures for these arguments of wanting to do as they consider other institutions are doing and other institutions even in Division III regarding all of our other institutions. They feel that if we do something specific that may be of a lesser nature, that we are placing them at a greater disadvantage toward an effort or the opportunity to be successful. I guess whereas institutional autonomy is very important, I do think that it is incumbent upon us to have some real parameters on a national scale that we look at, and I think it is important to make it as equitable as possible given the autonomy that we want for Division III.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): A couple of responses to two colleagues. John Schael, I agree wholeheartedly with what you said and the woman from Berea. I think they certainly were points well taken. Since we seem to be debating Proposition 30, let me call your attention to the fact that there is an amendment-to-amendment that would change the substance of a part of the resolution. A couple things could happen. If the amendment-to-amendment is approved and there was a move to defer Items B through G to allow the professionals to look at this over the next six months and come back with an overall program, I think that certainly is something you would want to consider. I concur that we should not put something that is flawed on the floor and then tinker with it later. Because once it is on the floor, sometimes the tinkering does not make it any better. I think there are some positive things here.

I think personally Franklin and Marshall can buy into the November 1 starting date for practice. I personally would oppose the section in F that says you cannot play your first game until December 1. So if you want a recommendation, you approve Section C and you defeat Section E. That leaves the start of the season exactly where it is now, and that is the weekend before Thanksgiving.

So, indeed, we could approve the resolution. We could cut back by a week and a half or two weeks on the amount of preseason practice, but we could still maintain the traditional start that has been effective for most of us for preseason tournaments the weekend before Thanksgiving. The kids could still go home and enjoy their Thanksgiving dinner with their families. If you want to reduce the number of contests by one, then approve G, and that is okay. I can buy into that.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): Thanks, Bill. I think you explained something. We can defeat Part F if we want to and agree to the November 1st. The only problem with December 1st is that we wait until next Convention; it is a scheduling problem for us. That is a real problem. We schedule two to three years in advance. I think what Bill has said is the direction we should take.

Rev. William J. Byron (Catholic University): That came up yesterday. I think the implementation is 1992, so they thought by next year they could, acknowledging that there could be some difficulty with the scheduling, still correct it in time.

Anthony L. LaScala (Illinois Benedictine College): As an athletics director and a basketball coach, I think one of the big considerations, and it was mentioned earlier, is the use of facilities, especially the support facilities. When you have a football team and a soccer team and a volleyball team and a cross country team using the training facilities, in a sense, the burden that is on your training staff is great. Then you bring in basketball the 15th of October to add to that, I would be—as a basketball coach for 25 years—I would be glad to go to November 1. I would be glad to go to 25 games. In fact, I told Al Van Wie how about 22?

But don't put in the starting date for a game as December 1, because I think we have to lengthen that area and give us a few more parameters. I can get a basketball team ready from November 1 until the first weekend prior to Thanksgiving. I can have a basketball team ready to play, and I think most coaches feel that way. We are waiting anxiously to play a game, really, because the kids get a little tired of us in practice and want to start the real meat of things. But the big thing is the real strain you put on facilities. You know, you have bad weather. The football team wants to come in and practice, and then you have the basketball team, both men and women, in there. It is a problem. So I think it is something we should really consider.

Gregory L. Lockard (Montclair State College): I am representing the New Jersey Athletic Conference here as well. I would like to step back a little bit and take a look at the big picture in Division III—what we are and where we are going. I think we are a great division. I think everybody in this room feels that. I think we also get hyperconservative when we leave these things. We see problems nationally, and we take a bold step. Not everybody else does, and the problems are still there.

I really don't think that is the direction in which we should be

moving. I think we are a good division. I think we can control it ourselves, and I think our athletes are having great experiences at that level. This is one more example of that. I really think that institutions can handle it on their own, and I think we need to reaffirm that. With the money coming down from some of the TV packages, I think we need to take a look at the championships and put more money in Division III and get what our athletes deserve, because championships are great educational experiences.

I think we need to reaffirm that rather than leaving a Convention like this again and finding that we have over-legislated in a division where I don't think the problems are quite as bad. I don't believe we are being abusive to our athletes.

Michael Steuerman (City University of New York Athletic Conference): I introduced myself in my professional capacity. I have been a coach. I have been a dean. I want to bring another constituency into this room that has not been brought in, and that is the parents. I am also a parent of two Division III athletes, and I know many in the audience are as well. One Division III athlete went to a school, one of our member institutions here, and was asked to do two practices a day, to play when injured, a very intense kind of competitive experience on a national level. That young man at one point said, "I have had enough of that experience." He went out for some other sports at that institution.

He was influenced by the kind of coach I would not want my youngster to be—he, in fact, was not influenced for any great length of time. Another athlete was influenced by a coach who did talk about hunting and fishing, who did talk about the value of a music concert that was going on, who accompanied the youngsters to activities on campus that were nonathletically related. That was the kind of person I wanted my youngster to be involved with, and my youngster wanted to be involved for 50 weeks a year and, in fact, was.

So the point I am making is where the decision is made. The focus of the decision, will it be national? Will it be institutional or is there some other level? Will it be conference by conference? I suggest that national legislation that diminishes the opportunity for that one youngster to be with a coach 50 weeks a year diminishes the opportunities for that youngster that any parent would want. Legislation that protects that other youngster if, in fact, that youngster needs protection, I am not sure is needed. Perhaps the parent, perhaps the youngster himself can protect themselves from that coach whose experience and whose competitive zeal is too intense.

Perhaps the youngster and the parent need to make that decision. I am not sure. I know what worked best for my young people. Where shall the decision be made? I don't know that I have the answer, but I think I have created some questions and brought a new constituency into the argument that I wanted to have here. Thank you.

Mr. Van Wie: I have to admit that it took you a little bit longer

than I thought it would get you warmed up, but I knew once Division III gets warmed up, the discussion will go on. Because of the length of the discussion, we are going to take approximately a 10-minute break right now.

[Note: The Division III business session was recessed for 10 minutes.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Admissions and Graduation-Rate Disclosures—Division III

Mr. Van Wie: The first proposal for Division III, Proposal 25, has been withdrawn. The steering committee has asked Jen Shillingford, director of athletics at Bryn Mawr College, to explain the reason for the withdrawal of Proposal 25.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): To the new steering committee members, I have a suggestion. Go out and buy a new filing cabinet. Many of you, I think, are aware that the Presidents Commission proposed graduation-rate disclosures for Divisions I and II, but not for Division III. They did so as a way of accountability, but also as a response to the Bradley Right to Know Act, which also did not include Division III. This is pending legislation in congress. In October, the Division III Steering Committee felt rather strongly that disclosing our graduation rates would not hurt us and would make a statement regarding Division III academics and our own accountability. Having been regarded over the years as "the conscience of the NCAA," perhaps it is time to put our money where our mouth is.

We, therefore, directed the NCAA staff to develop legislation reflecting the disclosure of graduation rates in Division III, and, as you know, the legislation that resulted and which was drafted in rather a short time was cumbersome. We felt that it would be time consuming and certainly expensive; and so with a certain amount of responsibility, I think the steering committee withdrew the amendment. There were some on the committee who wished it to go forward to test the waters, but I believe we would have tested a faulty piece of legislation rather than a concept. So today, later, President George Harmon will lead the discussion on graduation-rate disclosure, and he will do so in the context of academic requirements and responsibility.

This is surely your opportunity to tell us how you feel about the concept of graduation-rate disclosure. I urge you to listen, to respond and to let the steering committee know how you feel about this issue.

Nonathletics Achievement Award—Division III

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me call the delegates' attention to the blue sheets where No. 9 is an Interpretations Committee interpretation for this particular item that would be in place if it passes. Before coming back to that, let me give you the rationale for this proposal.

Current Division III financial aid regulations do not allow Division III student-athletes to receive leadership and merit awards beyond financial need. This proposal addresses the concerns that have been expressed in regard to those individuals who are at their financial-need limit and who qualify to receive a nonathletics achievement award or an academic award but who cannot receive the award because they are athletes.

A couple of examples might suffice. If on your campus you have an art student who competes in a campus-wide contest for sculpture and there is a \$200 or \$300 or \$400 stipend for the winner, and the winner happens to end up being a student-athlete who (1) either does not show need or (2) has a financial aid award that encompasses need, currently, that individual would be unable to accept that academic honor. Or, if you have a campus-wide contest for a piece of literature and someone writes the best essay and it is adjudicated by the English faculty as the most outstanding essay and there is a \$100 stipend and the individual happens to be a no-need student-athlete, right now, the legislation that is in force precludes that individual from being able to accept the stipend.

This proposal would allow the Council to establish a procedure to hear requests from Division III institutions on a case-by-case basis, to provide student-athletes with nonathletic achievement awards that go beyond the student's financial need. It is important to note that athletics ability or participation would not be a criteria and could not be a criteria in determining who would receive such an achievement award and that requests to give such awards must include documentation of the specific criteria utilized in determining the recipient of the award. This would not allow Division III institutions to award student-athletes leadership awards that do not include specific criteria or that include athletics participation as a criterion.

There has been some concern that we are discriminating against student-athletes that have particular academic skills, particular academic abilities; and that, indeed, is true. This piece of legislation would begin to address that issue. I would like to call to the attention of the membership the fact that I think we probably all are in violation to some extent or the other, and this legislation can address the issue.

When I say you probably all are in violation, let me give you an example. We probably all have honors programs or days when special awards are given on your campus for various academic and nonacademic reasons, and I would suspect that there are people on all of our campuses that get special awards from academic departments that we just kind of look the other way on. Technically, you are in violation.

Now, will this process be so cumbersome that it cannot be handled? Well, I think there is a process. I think the Council can appoint a subcommittee, and that is the intent. For those of us who currently are giving these kinds of awards—be they \$50 or \$500 or

somewhere in between—if it is an annual award, the award, the criteria, the process could be approved by the subcommittee on a one-time basis, much like we do awards of circumstance now. For those awards that are not an annual award but come up only periodically for particularly outstanding academic achievement, these would have to be administered on a case-by-case basis. That is what the subcommittee would do, and there are existing Council subcommittees that do something similar in Division I for entrance requirements. They seem to function all right. I think if the subcommittee of the Council is willing to assume this task, I would like to err on the side of the student so we don't discriminate against the student.

On behalf of the steering committee, I urge adoption of this proposal.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I would like to move the adoption of No. 51—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is really a clerical thing. Proposal No. 51, as printed, says that the leadership and merit awards would be deleted; that is not true. The amendment-to-amendment simply indicates that Bylaw 15.4.7 would not be deleted if nonathletics achievement awards approved by the Council were allowed to be provided to Division III student-athletes beyond need.

[Proposal No. 51—1 (Page A-59) was approved by Division III.]

Harlan Knosher (Knox College): At our school, perhaps others, we have situations arise where these kind of awards are made based on competition—let's say an art award. This student matriculates at Knox, is an unknown as far as the athletics department is concerned. The student receives the art award, it is built into his or her plan in terms of how they are going to finance their education. Subsequently, the individual decides to go out for, let's say, the swimming team, which was the case at our place. That roster is submitted to the director of financial aid, and that award is rescinded as far as that student is concerned.

This is a tough situation and one that I really think brings into complete focus the point and the good sound reasoning behind passing this particular piece of legislation.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I see my good friend Harlan Knosher came up. He has a lot of integrity, as does Bill Marshall. I have to reevaluate this. My only question is can this be awarded to a student who is not matriculating at the college. In other words, a nonfreshman, who has not been accepted as of yet.

Mr. Van Wie: Yes, incoming students are eligible for this award.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): That probably would be the only thing I would be concerned about. If they are in the college, I don't think I would have any concern with this. Because we keep using the term student-athlete. They are students, they are entitled to everything the other students are. I think we have to consider that. I would like to know, are there any statistics? How

many of these awards are we talking about? Are we talking just a few?

Mr. Marshall: No idea.

Mr. Bogan: I think the intent of the legislation is maybe good, but I think more research needs to be done on it. I think the Council should be empowered to do a study of something like this.

Dan Ghormley (Eastern College Athletic Association): Just as a clarification, under the interpretations, Point No. C, as I read this, if you have an art award and the wrestling coach happens to be the art professor and is the jury to judge that award, he cannot do that. Is that correct?

Mr. Van Wie: That is correct by this interpretation. I would really question how many wrestling coaches are art professors, but there could be some.

John R. Brazil (Southeastern Massachusetts University): Clarification on the ruling you made earlier regarding entering freshmen. In the fourth line, it says competition for such an award must be among all members of the student body. I would infer from that that they have to be enrolled, not merely accepted.

Mr. Marshall: I think this was talked about by the Interpretations Committee, and I think the interpretation was that once a student had been accepted and had decided to matriculate, he or she became a member of the student body.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): My concern with this legislation is one of administration and procedure more than anything else. I know many of us in Division III run a program with an athletics director and a secretary; and if we are going to be required to gather all these awards, submit them to another subcommittee created to deal with this one minor issue, I would hope that we could pass a piece of legislation such as this one and let it be self-administered so that if a situation arises, it is incumbent upon the athletics director to report and get it approved rather than create a huge paper trail for an incident that probably happens seldom on our campuses.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-58) was approved by Division III as amended by No. 51—1.]

Division III Baseball

Lynn King (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): Proposal No. 98 was a result of our conference perceiving a problem that we felt needed to be addressed by this organization. The problem that we observed actually had to do with on-staff coaches working and coaching or competing with summer baseball programs. Quite frankly, across the United States, there are many communities that have summer baseball teams, summer baseball leagues. Our intent with this amendment, quite frankly, was for our assistant coaches—many of whom are ad hoc, part-time coaches, many of whom are coaches who have just graduated, possibly still trying to work out toward working in professional baseball—to have an opportunity to continue on and coach. Quite frankly, the intent was

Division III Business Session

not to extend the season of our coaches; but as we looked at the amendment and began to deal with the NCAA in terms of how we would address this situation, it became apparent we would need to address it based upon the 21-week rule. It is certainly not our intent to mirror anything happening in Division I. That is the reason we also sponsored the amendment-to-amendment, which would clarify that we are not in the realm of funding the summer programs. I move the passage of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the amendment-to-amendment, Proposal No. 98—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment-to-amendment basically has to do with the fact that as we addressed this in the original issue, we were not concerned about financing these summer programs. What we were concerned about was providing the opportunity during the summer period, and that is what spawned the amendment-to-amendment, which you find before you today.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): What does no limitations mean?

Ms. King: In essence, based upon the interpretation that we have received from the NCAA, the "no limitation" is concerning just the practice opportunities for the student-athletes.

Mr. Bogan: This is the practice during the academic year or in the summer that we are talking about?

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Does that mean that if you started your traditional season the first week in March and you took your 21 weeks, it could extend right on through June and July and there would be no limitations on that except that you could not provide expenses?

Mr. King: Actually, what it does entail is that the 21-week season would apply to the academic year only.

Mr. Marshall: So you have 21 weeks during the academic year and then no limitations in the summer?

Mr. King: Correct.

Mr. Marshall: Which means you have more than 21 weeks.

Mr. King: That is correct. Again, the intent is to address the freedom of the student-athletes and the freedom of the coaches to participate on the same teams during that summer period.

Mr. Marshall: That freedom exists now, but there are some limitations that say you cannot go beyond a certain number on the summer team.

Mr. King: But you cannot compete with student-athletes that have eligibility on that team at that collegiate institution. Our assistant coach could not compete with our student-athletes or coach student-athletes at our institution in a summer program, in a summer league; and that is what we are addressing.

Mr. Marshall: So I guess with this amendment, the membership has to decide whether they want 21 weeks plus or just 21 weeks?

Mr. King: In essence, that is correct. The 21-week limitation, if

you look at the initial amendment, talks about 21 weeks during the academic year.

David T. Nelson (Luther College): I would like to ask you for clarification of "may not provide expenses," whether that means that the facilities of the institution may not be used.

Mr. King: Again, it is our intent that facilities could be used, and that is something specifically that we requested from the NCAA in terms of our interpretation.

George Chryst (University of Wisconsin, Platteville): I would like to try to clear it up a little bit more. The problem that we were running into was with a kid who was helping our baseball team, coaching on our baseball team. He then plays for a city league. We are in a small town. All of a sudden, two other kids are playing that may or may not come out for his team. All of a sudden, they come out for the team, and he is in violation. We are trying to address a very common thing. Kids play baseball. We don't have a full-time baseball coach. The guy that happens to coach baseball happens to run the city team.

Now, we are trying to make it possible—not to extend the season—for the kid to play without jeopardizing eligibility. How much coaching is there in city-league baseball? In our situation, I think they played three games together; but they are in violation. So, what we are trying to do is come up with a rule that allows kids to play and allows young coaches to play without jeopardy.

F. Paul Bogan: I think the intent is fine, but this legislation with no limitation creates an awful lot of problems. I had a coach who wanted to coach in the summer; he could not this year, and I agree. I think we should allow that opportunity, but your legislation here really does not say that. I think it addresses some other issues and it bothers me with this no limitation. I think you should take it back and rewrite it.

[Proposal No. 98—1 (Page 94) was defeated.]

Gordon Collins (College of Wooster): Someone mentioned having an assistant coach who wants to play in a city league and who may have one or two of his players who also want to play in that league and the current legislation precludes that. If we pass this legislation, could that also mean that that coach could take his whole team and enter it in the city league in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, or wherever and have that as his team in that city league for that summer and do whatever coaching he wanted? Is that not possible if we pass this legislation?

Mr. Van Wie: I believe that is correct.

Mr. Collins: That makes me very nervous.

E. Theodore Kershner (Glassboro State College): Glassboro State College and the New Jersey Athletic Conference strongly support this amendment, and we think that this would be a great opportunity for the youngsters in our small colleges to be able to participate in summer baseball with limited restrictions. We also do not think that there should be any funding from the school, but

we think that facilities should be made available, if necessary.

John F. Sirianni (Simpson College): I am the athletics director and baseball coach. I do not support this idea. It would be nice if our assistant coaches could play, but I think to pass this amendment would make the opportunity available to really increase the pressure and intensity during the summer, and it would increase expenses over the long run.

Anthony L. La Scala (Illinois Benedictine College): I guess my question is on expenses. Do you include use of uniforms; bats; balls, and transportation that the college may have, like vans and so forth? Is that part of the expense?

Mr. Van Wie: I think you raise a good question, Tony. The Legislation and Interpretations Committee would have to rule on that. The chair will not make seat-of-the-pants interpretations at this meeting.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-93) was defeated by Division III.]

Out-of-Season Practice Limitations

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 103 continues to disallow team tennis-practice activities outside the declared tennis playing season but does allow individual voluntary instruction between tennis-playing students and coaches outside the 21-week playing season. The 10 Division III member sponsors selected the individual sport of tennis as a symbol of the six individual Division III sports that currently are restricted from any practice contact outside the 21 weeks. Two are split-season sports, tennis and golf, and the other four are cross country, track, swimming and wrestling.

Philosophically, the sponsors would want the restriction removed in all six. Vote for 103, and we think this will happen on a longer term.

These six Division III individual-sport programs currently, and maybe some are not aware of this, are the only individual programs in the NCAA that have any restriction on student access to coaching on an individual basis. All Division I individual-sport programs completely are unrestricted. All Division II individual-sport programs completely are unrestricted. All Division III individual-sport programs with a single national championship—that is, fencing, gymnastics, rifle, skiing and golf, women's golf—also are completely unrestricted.

I have had several communications in response to my letter that I sent to all Division III athletics directors in support of No. 103. Two were negative. One simply asked how a quarterback is different from a tennis player. The other simply said it was beyond imagination why a 21-week season in any sport is not entirely sufficient.

More, many more, were in favor of the proposal. Some simply said because they thought Division III was somehow out of control: some because they know it causes cheating—easy cheating—because the

students want access, and some because they feel sad and somehow ashamed at Division III for selecting six individual sports as the only access-restricted sports. At MIT, 95 percent of the student body was in the top 10 percent of their high school class. Some 350 out of 1,100 were class valedictorians. None of our male or female student tennis players can accept the current restrictions.

You read, I think, two of their letters that I sent out with a mailing to all of you November 15th. Frankly, our students are angry and confused. You have read what two students had to say in the attachment. I hope you read those letters carefully. They are two highly talented students who athletically are eager and who are, in our view, deprived of coaching access on our campus. There is no overemphasis or athletics abuse at MIT. The abuse is in the restriction. Ask any of our students. Ask any Division III student, in my view, anywhere in the country. Voluntary coaching help means just that. There is no Division III student on a tennis scholarship. There are no Division III students on any kind of scholarship above need. There are very few Division III institutions in the country who even admit a student only for athletics ability. Most can do academic work well. Most want coaching help any time they can have it.

It seems to me it is also in the philosophy of the other institutions that sponsored this—Brandeis, Luther, Mary Washington, Regis, Simmons and many others. It seems to me that here is our opportunity to correct what I believe is a serious mistake of over-legislation. Allow Division III tennis as a symbol of the other six to be free of a restriction that makes me sad and even angry about Division III. I always have been proud of Division III, very proud after seven years in Division I to come to this division. I would like to see this division pass this legislation. I urge support of 103. Thank you.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I was one of the two who wrote negative letters. Gee, I thought I would have a lot more support in the writing process. As I hear the arguments, I tend to lean more towards Royce's side of the argument; but I have a major concern that it violates the philosophy of Division III. My concern was overemphasis.

I think as athletics directors, many of us have encountered overzealous coaches who want to extend the season with individual help, with semirequired weightlifting programs in the off-season, and career climbers who we all love because they give us winning teams but who come in and want to dominate the student-athlete's time in the off-season. That is why I like at least the 21-week season; and if we are talking about an incidental coaching experience with an athlete, I am all for that. But my concern is preventing the extension of the season by what the student feels is required activity in a sport. Not that it is an organized practice; but because the coach puts pressure on that student-athlete to get working in the off-season, the student-athlete feels he is not going to be able to cut it when the real season starts.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): I wrote the other letter and asked the quarterback question, so I think it is incumbent upon me to respond, also. I think Royce made a beautiful presentation and had great rationale, and I am very empathetic to everything he said. However, I am less sympathetic when I begin to realize that because I play in a team sport, I am not allowed to have the same opportunities that students are allowed to have because they play an individual sport.

A skill is a skill whether it is running, kicking, jumping or striking; and if we allow some students to do that and be coached in that all year long, then I think we are being very discriminatory against those who choose to participate in team sports. I don't have any qualms whatsoever with students developing their own skills all year long and practicing on their own. It is the supervised part that bothers me when we allow for some and not for others. So, I think although the legislation attempts to speak of freeing and liberating the students, the attempt actually is forfeited because it hinders other students.

John Zinda (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): Last year, this proposal was on for everybody, and it was defeated. It seems to me to be inconsistent with national-level legislation if we legislate for one sport. It seems very inconsistent to me. I am strongly in favor of the proposal, but I don't think that the argument that we will pass this and then we will get to another sport next time is a good argument. The animosity that this is going to create on campuses across this country when we single out one sport over another sport at the national level is going to be disastrous. I know that coaches in our conference who have had that rule taken away from us wants this passed on the national level. They don't want to see one sport be given a special consideration.

Gregory Lockard (College Swimming Coaches of America, Inc.): Speaking on behalf of the College Swimming Coaches Association, with over 600 members, we see this as a window of opportunity and a move in the right direction. We agree with Royce. We see it as a powerful move, and we think it would be good down the road. I think we need to look at the whole picture and move everybody into this. But I really see it as a test case, and I believe it is going to work. I believe it is going to be acceptable, and I think we can move into it, take a small step. I think this is a nice opportunity to take a step in the right direction.

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): So far, I have heard every speaker say they are in favor of one-on-one coaching. Number two, I have heard everybody say they are in favor of all the six individual sports that I mentioned being covered in one-on-one coaching. I am saying that by passing No. 103 I can assure you that both those things that you are in favor of will happen within a year. Let's vote for 103. Let's vote for our principles. Let's not over-think the legislation. Let's make this happen for the students that want it and then go from there. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-98) was defeated by Division III, 84-152.]

High-School Contest—Division III

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): I am the commissioner of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, and I would like to move adoption of Proposal 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

Voting delegates, as the commissioner of this conference, part of my job is to visit the 26 members of the conference and discuss typical problems on campuses. One of the things that came to the forefront in those discussions was that many of our schools that are located in relatively small communities have a common problem. That problem centers on the lack of community support for Division III athletics, community interest in Division III schools. One of the things that constantly was reported was that high-school games in local communities are being played in front of standing-room-only crowds while the college team might be playing in front of hundreds of empty seats.

It seemed like a great way to take advantage of the larger capacity at the local college and bring in a local high-school team, give it the opportunity to play in a nicer facility. By the same token, hopefully, the fans who might have been closed out by small seating capacities would then be able to stay and watch the college game.

This clearly is not intended as a recruiting tool in any way, shape or fashion. It does not get into any of the areas that could be problems for anyone, and the 50-mile limitation is designed to ensure that. We hope on behalf of the conference that this will be adopted by Division III's membership.

[Proposal No. 121 (Page A-113) was approved by Division III.]

Tryouts—Division III Recreational Activities

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, prospects visiting a member institution may not participate in recreational activities during such a visit if the activities involve a sport for which the prospect is being recruited. This proposal would permit Division III prospects to participate in recreational activities in any sport during a visit to the Division III campus provided the activities are not organized or observed by members of the athletics department staff.

For example, a prospective track student-athlete could run during his or her visit to a Division III campus, just as any prospective student would be allowed to run during such a visit. I would also submit that the title of this proposal may be misleading for it is the exact opposite of a tryout. It is named tryout because it is found in

that portion of the Manual. This proposal is consistent with the Division III philosophy of treating student-athletes the same as students in general, and I urge its adoption.

William Stier Jr. (Brockport State University College): Just a clarification. Does this preclude the possibility of a basketball player playing basketball at a college and being viewed by other basketball players who are already at that college?

Mr. Van Wie: The steering committee said that, for example, if it was not at the direction of the coach, the basketball player was staying overnight and the kids were going to play a pick-up game, that he would be allowed to play or she would be allowed to play.

Mr. Stier: I guess I feel uncomfortable with that. What is the difference between that and a tryout if that athlete could compete with potential team members that he or she may be competing with in the future? In addition to that, if I was a high-school athlete going to a college, I would sure want to show off what I could do to other student-athletes on that campus. I mean, it opens up a Pandora's box.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): As a member of the interpretations committee, I think what would happen in a case like this if it was brought before the committee, we would interpret this legislation in this fashion: If the participation was orchestrated or arranged by a coach and/or if the student-athletes that the individual was playing with reported to the coach about the person's relative ability, they would be in violation.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I am in support of this, and I would like to give a situation that occurred at North Central with our track and cross country coach. We had and we have had and probably will have a number of athletes come on campus to visit who are interested in cross country, and those individuals like to run when they come. If they are there for an overnight visit, they want to run. The problem is that if they are not familiar with the community, where do they run?

In the past, before we realized that we could not do it, we have had athletes run with him. Sure, you want to go out for a run? We have a morning run. You can run along with the athletes. With the legislation as it stands now, they cannot do that. They have to go out and find their own way around in the community. I don't think that is a positive situation. We would like to have our athletes be able to run with prospects if they would like to, and I think that would be positive. It is not a tryout. It is an opportunity to show him around, and I think it would work well.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): I think there are more important things that I would like to have youngsters doing at Salisbury State than worrying about trying out for the team or doing those kinds of things. It is certainly great to have some recreational activity going on, but I think that there are other things that I would like to see them doing. I would like to be able to know that they have all the admissions information they need, that they

are able to talk to some of our counselors, able to do many, many different things in visiting our campus. I feel that our intramural and campus recreation department and others are very astute at these kind of things, but I don't feel that that is their major priority. I think that we could serve ourselves better by not passing this legislation.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): I rise to support this proposal for two reasons. One is that I find it difficult to prohibit students from doing this just on a personal basis, I guess, and, secondly, if it were a tryout, what difference would it make? I mean, I cannot believe that I can go to my admissions director and say, "The kid looked pretty good in a pool. I think we ought to admit him." I think we are dealing with ghosts here. I don't think the problem exists. We are talking about simplifying Division III. Here is our first opportunity. Let's do it.

Anthony L. La Scala (Illinois Benedictine College): I have to agree with Rocco. You know, we are not giving athletic scholarships. The coaches already know whether the kid can run or whether he cannot run. They are not going to turn a kid away from their squad. At the Division III level, I would say there probably are very few programs that cut kids from a program, so I really don't see us being in trouble letting the kid run or swim or bounce the basketball or whatever it is. If I don't know the talent of a kid before he comes to visit the college, I think I have done a poor job of coaching and recruiting; and as Rocco says, we don't tell the admissions office who to accept and who not to accept. Thank you.

[Note: Proposal No. 123 (Page A-114) was approved by Division III.]

DIVISION III FORUM

Academic Requirements

Mr. Van Wie: An issue that has commanded a great deal of time on the Division III Steering Committee is the question of academic requirements in Division III. Chairing our forum on this important topic is President Robert Bottoms of DePauw University.

Robert G. Bottoms (DePauw University): Thank you very much, Al. I have looked forward to this forum to give all of us the opportunity to discuss whether or not we need legislation in Division III dealing with academic requirements. At first glance, this question seems an odd one to raise. All of us in Division III have taken great pride in the fact that we keep the proper balance between academics and athletics, and some of us probably see this discussion as one casting a shadow on the debate going on in Division I where they are quite vocal in their debates about whether or not athletics need minimum standards and, in fact, what those standards should be, whether or not athletes make satisfactory progress toward degrees, and whether or not they should publish graduation rates.

Now, you have heard these debates. Division III, most of us would

agree, I think, would say on one level that we are very pleased we have not dealt with these issues. In fact, we would argue we are pleased we have never had to deal with these issues. It is clear from the morning discussion that we don't really like the Division I model, and so many would argue, therefore, we don't need to even talk about minimum standards. We are cleaner than that. We are more pure than that. Our admissions and our athletics needs are in the proper perspective. Some of us would argue that our institutions are so pure, in fact, that any athlete who might be in poor standing at another institution would not even be admitted to one of our Division III institutions or that any athlete unqualified for admission in a Division I or II institution would certainly not be accepted in a Division III institution. We would argue that there is no need even to raise the question of whether or not our athletes are making satisfactory progress toward a degree.

Another group of people might ask whether these things really are true, and do they continue to be true year after year? The skeptic might look at Division III and ask whether with over 300 institutions, is it not possible that some athletes might be admitted to our institutions who might not qualify for participation in Division I or II? Is it also not possible that in some of our institutions athletes play and participate who are not making satisfactory progress toward a degree? And, finally, is it not possible that, in fact, on occasion, some athletes might have to leave one institution in poor academic standing and transfer to one of our institutions and begin playing immediately?

So do we need to deal with this issue? Is it significant enough? Do we need to have legislation? As I have already indicated, I think some of you believe we do. I think others of you believe we do not, and so we scheduled this forum.

We have three speakers. Lorna P. Straus from the University of Chicago will be our first speaker. Lorna is a member of the Academic Requirements Committee. She will be the chair of this committee beginning September 1990. She will talk to us a bit about her experience as a member of the Academic Requirements Committee and just how difficult it is to put into place this legislation some people call for. Our second speaker is Charles G. Vahlkamp, faculty athletics representative at Centre College, who will present the argument that, in fact, we in Division III do need academic requirements for our athletes. Our third speaker, Patricia A. Rogers, who is the associate director of athletics and chair of the physical education department at the State University of New York, Albany, and also a member of the Division III Steering Committee. She will present the case that we really don't need legislation dealing with academic requirements; and as I kidded her, she has the perhaps unenviable position of arguing against academic requirements.

Lorna P. Straus (University of Chicago): Thank you, Bob. I have the unenviable job of describing the process as it now is in

place for Divisions I and II. As we all are aware, Proposition 48 established academic requirements for initial eligibility for athletics participation in Division I and set the requirements for satisfactory progress toward a degree. Division II joined Division I in having those requirements not very many years later. Those requirements for initial eligibility are a minimum test score on either the SAT or ACT. The test has to have been taken at a regular testing session. A specified core of courses taken in high school also is required. This core includes courses in English, social studies, math, science; and those courses have to have been completed with at least a 2.000 grade-point average.

The Academic Requirements Committee participated in the establishment of general mechanisms for implementing Proposition 48 and now responds to questions and problems that are raised, and I assure you there are plenty of opportunities to keep us busy. Examples: How do you deal with a learning-disabled student who has not taken all of the core courses? Should a course taken in high school in accounting or in statistics count as math? What should be the role of remedial work that a student takes in high school. How do you handle a student who is not eligible to start mathematics until perhaps the tenth or eleventh grade because as a ninth or 10th grader he is taking prealgebra arithmetic?

What is the process that the Divisions I and II institutions now follow? There are two forms. One would expect there would be forms; and indeed, there are. They are numbered 48 after the proposition that led to their creation—48-H, 48-C. Form 48-H is filled out by the high school. It lists the courses offered by that high school in the various core categories. The high school needs to fill this out for each school to which one of its students is applying.

The college then fills out 48-C for each prospective student-athlete. Someone at the college takes that student's transcript, his or her high school's Form 48-H, and determines whether the core has been met; what the student's grade-point average is, and from the application for admission, learns the test score on the national SAT or ACT. Out of this process comes the determination that the individual student-athlete applicant is or is not initially eligible for participation in athletics at that institution. There are, of course, problems and difficulties with which the Academic Requirements Committee deals.

Form 48-H can be unclear. To give you a few examples: What is the content of a course which the high school tells you is called "community"? Some of the courses listed as language arts under the English heading may or may not be what we mean by English. And then some of the 48-H forms are incorrect. We like to assume this is by inadvertence; but whatever the source, institutions report that there are many phone calls to high schools requesting clarification of course content.

Then, another kind of problem arises at the inter-institutional/conference level, and that is the problem of inconsistency. Some col-

leges will count a particular high-school course as meeting a core requirement, and others won't.

Individuals on our Academic Requirements Committee from Divisions I and II report their dismay at finding on an opponent's team someone they had determined did not meet initial eligibility standards.

This has led to the proposal of a national clearinghouse, and a study to identify the costs associated with it is currently underway. This clearinghouse would be something like the College Scholarship Service, of which most of us are aware, that provides the same financial data to all schools to which a prospective student applies. A clearinghouse for initial athletics eligibility would develop core-course lists for each high school, would obtain an official high-school transcript that the student applicant would have sent to the clearinghouse, would evaluate the transcript and would determine eligibility. The attractiveness of this proposal is that, of course, it would ensure consistency. What is not known is how much it would cost in dollars and how long it would take for an institution to find out if a student-athlete applicant is eligible.

If Division III decides to establish some sort of academic requirements for athletics eligibility, we can build on Divisions I and II's experience. We can have the same standards they do of core courses, GPA and test scores or we can have just a grade-point average or just a minimum test score or we could have the same components with different minimums.

Those would be some of the subjects that we would have to discuss and decide. One other thing would become necessary, and that is a mechanism to deal with individual situations. Divisions I and II use a Council subcommittee to deal with requests for waivers of initial-eligibility requirements, situations such as when the student was planning to take the SAT in June prior to starting college but did not due to a death in his family; so he did not meet the rule that the test must be taken by July 1st; or the student who had, indeed, two years of science but instead of a year of laboratory science only one semester was taken, and this may or may not have been the result of a limitation in what was available in his or her high school. Each individual case needs to be responded to in the spirit of fairness to the individual and to the principles of the NCAA legislation. Those of us who follow The NCAA News see the lists of cases that are considered by this special subcommittee. The list is not a short one.

There is another factor in addition to the initial-eligibility requirements. That is the factor of minimum standards for continued eligibility, the determination of satisfactory progress toward a degree. This has been the subject of debate and a variety of proposals for Divisions I and II. As it stands, the student-athlete must be a full-time student, which is defined as being registered for 12 hours or its equivalent in the term of athletics participation, and he or she must have completed at least 24 hours in the prior academic

year.

Here, too, there are questions and problems. How should unusual academic calendars be handled? What about cooperative work-study programs? How should we handle those? How much remedial work taken in college should count towards satisfactory progress? It would interest you, I am sure, to know that the Academic Requirements Committee has discussed this last issue at considerable length and has agreed that no more than 12 hours of remedial work can be taken and counted towards satisfactory progress. This means that if the student-athlete has had to or has wanted to take additional remedial work, it does not count toward the 24 that he or she needs to have completed for a second year of participation.

I hope I have described to you the extent of the questions that have been raised, the extent of the processing that is necessary, the extent of the paper work that comes with the kind of academic requirements that Divisions I and II have. There is no question that having academic requirements sends an important message; but if we go that route, we do have to be aware of the bookkeeping requirements that go along with the establishment of division-wide academic standards. Thank you.

Charles G. Vahlkamp (Centre College): Lorna's description of the processes, paper work and so forth could almost end the discussion right here. Certainly, it is a description that I think is not meant to be biased in any way. Certainly it is not neutral, either, exactly. It says a lot about where we stand. I am going to have to be careful here. I might argue the wrong side, a side I am not supposed to be on.

We have in this discussion a more hypothetical area than we had with the earlier one in that there is no legislation on the current agenda; and therefore, we are debating, if that is the word, discussing in somewhat of a vacuum. I am not absolutely sure how much of an issue this is. I hope we are not creating an issue where there is not one, but I think it would serve the purpose of this forum if I tried to think of proposals that could be put forth in the area of academic requirements applied in Division III.

The first possibility would be to extend the Proposition 48 requirements into Division III—I have heard some discussion of that—on the grounds that the NCAA, the Association as a whole, should not allow, should not leave a hole, a gap in the overall Association to which relatively low-qualified student-athletes or prospective student-athletes could go.

Currently, of course, most of them, my guess is, are—if they are not going to the Divisions I and II institutions, they are going to the two-year institutions, areas which the NCAA cannot control. The NCAA conceivably could control what goes on with the entire Association and, therefore, could extend Proposition 48 to include Division III.

Another possible area of legislation would be to change the current regulations regarding transfers. We could establish periods of

ineligibility following transfer. We have just gone in the other direction over the last two or three years. We could reinstitute that on the grounds that it would discourage Division I athletes who are not doing well academically in their institution from transferring to Division III. Let me say at this point that I have absolutely no data, and I don't know whether anybody does, to show that there are large numbers of athletes, student-athletes doing this. Maybe someone has some information and will speak after the three of us have spoken. I do not know the extent of the problem in numbers. I have no idea, also, how many nonqualifiers are enrolling in Division III institutions. I don't think the data has been gathered in any systematic fashion, but someone may be able to speak to that.

I suppose we also could propose legislation dealing with the issue of students who fail to meet academic requirements in one institution, that is, who are suspended for academic reasons. There might be a way to legislate in such a way that they could not be admitted at all to Division III institutions or they could not be admitted with immediate eligibility. We get into, I think, a real difficult area here. The Association, I don't think, wants to get in to dictating admissions standards to individual institutions. It does not do that in any division that I know of. It does, however, in the divisions other than Division III try to impose standards for initial eligibility; and that, I suppose, then, could be done in Division III.

Any proposal of this sort, of course, needs to be thought of in terms of the Division III philosophy statements, and the one that says all students should be treated alike certainly comes to mind here, and I am about to argue the other side. I better not do that. We could handle all of this—if it is an issue—by having our athletics departments, our faculties and perhaps even our CEO's, instead of singing the National Anthem before our athletics contests, we could all recite a pledge of allegiance to the Division III philosophy on a regular basis. That way, we won't forget it so often.

One other item that relates to this topic has to do with the diversity of institutions in Division III. There are institutions with open admissions in Division III. There are others that are highly selective; and we could, I suppose, in opposition to what is being done in any other division, determine some sort of admissions standards that would then apply only to athletes. That is not a very good argument.

The final area I would mention would be having to do with satisfactory progress, and I am not familiar enough with the way in which that operates in the divisions where it exists to know exactly what to do with it. I don't think that it is something that is considered to be a huge success in the other divisions, but that is an area that we could have some legislation proposed in. Thank you.

Patricia A. Rogers (State University of New York, Albany): Frankly, when Mr. Van Wie called my office to ask me to participate in this forum, I was surprised, not reluctant, but surprised, because I did not really feel that we had a great problem in this

area. However, he did assure me that particularly since the deregulation of the transfer rules, he had received numerous phone calls and some letters which expressed concern about academic standards in Division III.

I am not here to argue against academic standards. I am here, however, basically to express the view against the legislation of academic standards in Division III. Our NCAA constitution states that "intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational process and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general."

I know that this is the statement to which Joe was referring. I think that we should look at the statement often. Shouldn't this statement in our constitution and the fact that our institutions are accredited by national academic agencies be enough for us? Do we really need a Proposition 48? Do we want more bureaucracies, more paper work, more tedium, more files in our offices and more expenditures for administrative assistants who do our paper work or work until midnight doing it ourselves? Do we really believe it is appropriate to attempt to legislate admission and academic standards, which if our philosophy remains intact would have to be applicable to all the students in our institution? Do we believe that an institution should be forbidden to admit a student who meets the general admission requirements just because he or she is an athlete? Should the nonathlete be admissible and the athlete nonadmissible?

It seems that on the surface, since the deregulation of the transfer rule, two problems have come to light or at least have been expressed; and they have been alluded to by the previous speakers. One is the Division I athlete who transfers or attempts to transfer after doing poorly academically at the previous institution. I say what is basically wrong with a Division III institution accepting that athlete if he or she is admissible under the school's admission requirements, is determined to have academic potential and receives academic support services and guidance towards the completion of a degree at our institution? Is that not what they are about? What is the real root of concern from the other schools who will face that athletics competition? Is it for the student-athlete and his or her vulnerability or is it the concern that your opponent will be more competitive with that athlete on their roster? In terms of the Division III to III transfers who now are immediately eligible—and this concern, I believe, comes particularly with the mid-year transfer—I wonder whether the fears are generated by a genuine concern for the student-athletes or are concerns based solely on the effect of the team, the win-loss record and the possibility that someone else may reach postseason competition.

Perhaps it even comes down at times to a coach's fragile ego. Hav-

ing spent time recruiting and training that young person, only now to lose him or her not thinking that perhaps not enough time was spent and not enough concern was there for that athlete's academic, psychological or social adaptation to the college environment. If the concern is coming from a third-party school, let's say in a conference, there should be appropriate mechanisms for the athletics directors to question and report cases that they believe are out of line. We should not be reluctant to do this if the facts warrant such action, and our conferences willingly should investigate the circumstances and report their findings and take action, if necessary. If an independent institution is involved, why not report the concern through appropriate athletics and college administrative officers?

Why is it that even in Division III, we are such a tight society, the old boys club and the old girls club, increasingly competitive and yet seemingly afraid to report with appropriate evidence, not just suspicion, what we believe are situations that take advantage of our athletes? Does it take national legislation to do that? I believe not; for as we all know, currently, there are violations of NCAA regulations that are not reported. They are just mumbled and grumbled around until they become so flagrant that surely someone must notice and something must be done about it. Why does it take legislation to help us keep our house clean? Why can't we believe in our own integrity and cultivate it in those with less integrity? As a current member of the Division III Steering Committee, I would be very interested in your discussion and will certainly be receptive, as will the other members of the steering committee, to your opinions and your requests for action.

At this time, I would ask your indulgence while I personally thank Al Van Wie for being such a great leader for the Division III Steering Committee and thank Mary Barrett and Bill Marshall for their help as I became accustomed to the steering committee process. I welcome the new members and look forward to working with them and our new vice-president, Rocco Carzo, and I thank you, the Division III membership, for continuing to be active participants in your Association. Thank you.

Robert G. Bottoms (DePauw University): Well, I think just to follow up on what Pat said and speaking as a member of the Council, the issue for us to address are those mumbles in the hallways. There are letters that come in. There are allegations that are made. We do have a tendency not to confront one another. We have a tendency, I think, to talk about the integrity of all the institutions; and we certainly don't like to publicly challenge the integrity of another.

If you sit on the Council—as Pat mentioned—you get calls. I have received similar calls or letters. The purpose of this forum is to ask whether there is a legitimate concern on behalf of the membership or are we talking about isolated instances that are exactly that. On behalf of the Council, I think I would be accurate in saying if there

is a concern, we would be glad to address it, but our workload is heavy enough. We are not interested in attacking a problem that you don't perceive exists, so we would very much like to hear from you.

I am perfectly willing, Mr. Chair, to say no one feels we have any problems.

Mr. Van Wie: We have got one.

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, I hate to stand in contradiction to that, but our conference has had some discussion on this, particularly concerning the Division III transfer rule. We have been concerned about the possibility of transfers from Divisions I and II who have not met academic requirements, in fact may have left institutions with a zero grade-point average and then become immediately eligible at Division III members.

A suggestion to deal with that type of situation, that a transfer would be immediately eligible if he or she transferred an average of 12 credits per semester of attendance at the preceding institution with an overall grade-point average of 2.000, all of which would be acceptable towards an identifiable degree at the new institution; or, Plan B, transfer a minimum of 12 credits earned in the last semester of attendance at the preceding institution with an overall grade-point average of 2.000 or greater for that last semester, and all of those credits must be accepted towards an identifiable degree at the new institution.

For those students who do not meet either of the criteria mentioned before, the transfer student would have to pass a minimum of 12 credits toward an identifiable degree with the 2.000 at the new institution before becoming eligible.

Personally, I feel this is something that should be considered seriously in Division III to avoid the problem of students who are transferring in and transforming division members into instant national contenders in championships and subsequently wind up not completing their degrees or, in fact, flunking out of the new Division III school one semester or one year later.

Timothy E. Morgan (Christopher Newport College): At the Dixie Conference meeting yesterday, there were several concerns expressed about the issue of transfers; and we will be preparing some legislation to that effect to be submitted for next year's Convention perhaps.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): If there is an issue before us that we should study, I think this is it. There is a problem, which many of us may not state, but who feel that it is improper to leave an institution with standards considered to be inappropriate and immediately attend another institution, take 12 credit hours and be a member of that athletics team and, in fact, play against the team that the student-athlete just left. The problem is we feel as that that youngster could have the support services where he is or she is, say, for example, at Salisbury State or

elsewhere; but if there are support services at another institution, that does not mean, for example, that we don't have those support services as well or that we did not initiate those support services for that youngster. But to be able to be in good academic standing immediately without proving academic performance value, I think, is an issue that we need to address. It is a problem.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): It appears to me that the issue is not academic-requirement standards but, really, more the transfer rule. The concern that has been expressed is that I think the Division III Steering Committee needs to look at a possible change in the transfer rule rather than worrying about all of the paper work and such with academic requirements.

[The meeting was recessed for lunch.]

Monday Afternoon, January 8, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Mr. Van Wie presiding.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division III business session heard petitions for waivers of Division III membership criteria from Guilford College, Thomas Moore College and Waynesburg College. The petitions were approved.]

DIVISION III FORUM CONTINUED

Graduation Disclosures

Mr. Van Wie: Following our discussion on the question of academic requirements in Division III is the issue of graduation disclosures in Division III. On this issue, the Division III Subcommittee of the Presidents Commission and the Division III Steering Committee took opposing positions. We have asked President George Harmon of Millsaps College, a member of the Division III Steering Committee, who supports the proposition that Division III members should be required to disclose their graduation rates, and Father William J. Byron, president of Catholic University, to address this body on this issue.

Following their discussion, the Division III Steering Committee has requested that we have a straw vote on this issue so that we can give some direction to our steering committee in the coming year.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): You already are aware that Proposal No. 25 has been withdrawn and of the basic reasons for that withdrawal. Essentially, it was clear to the Division III Steering Committee that there simply had not been sufficient time or opportunity to provide the context for the legislation to the membership and for the legislation to be drafted in an acceptable form.

My remarks today will attempt to clarify the reasons behind the decision of the steering committee last October to request the legislation in the first place and why, despite its action to withdraw the proposal, the committee has overwhelmingly reaffirmed its support of the idea of Division III publicly reporting admissions and

graduation data. At the close of this session, as Al said, we hope to have an expression of whether the membership is in support of this idea.

If the answer is yes, we will pursue the matter until legislation is formulated that accomplishes the objective while minimizing the related definitional and administrative problems. If the answer is no, then we have other things to do. The broad context of our action is important. No one here is unaware of the fact that colleges and universities have been under a growing cloud of suspicion and mistrust for the past several years, which continues today. The former secretary of education was highly vocal and highly effective in his criticism of all of higher education. A number of books and a constant stream of editorials have added fuel to the fire.

More recently, a number of prestigious independent colleges and universities have come under the cloud for alleged price fixing. The abuses in college athletics by what we all know, or at least think we know, to be a relatively few institutions is a significant part, but only a part of this whole scene. The result is a national outcry for accountability and reform by all of us, including Division III institutions.

In the interim, all of higher education is being penalized in a number of ways, including, for example, reductions in Federal assistance to students. With respect to Divisions I and II athletics, past legislation proposed by the Presidents Commission and by the Council relative to academic standards, cost control and now the reporting of graduation rates are but responses to the criticisms; and all are interrelated. Division III has through the years held itself to be above the fray. We as a group have remained basically true to the concept of the student-athlete engaged in amateur athletics. -157- We have insisted that our student-athletes be treated as other students and have been largely successful in separating ourselves from the massive administrative burden of complying with detailed rules and regulations designed, as in Division I and II, to assure a level playing field, and in minimizing the rules, regulations and reporting requirements, we have been essentially trusting of one another, and the system overall has worked well through the years. That is one of the real advantages of membership in Division III.

Why, then, would the Division III Steering Committee even consider being in favor of voluntarily introducing a system to report and publicize our graduation rates or possibly at some point in the future setting minimum-academic standards or satisfactory-progress rules or perhaps reconsidering transfer rules? As president of a relatively small Division III college, I certainly don't relish the thought of another complicated report to be added to the many already required in nonathletics areas.

I believe there are two primary reasons for the position taken by the steering committee. First, and I think and hope that this is the more important of the two, is that we have much to gain and little

or nothing to lose by voluntarily, without pressure from Sen. Bradley now or later, or by the media or anyone else, in joining Divisions I and II in publishing our admissions and graduation rates. I say the same with respect to minimum-academic standards and related matters. First, the membership of Division III emphasizes as its primary interest our student-athletes as students and is, therefore, anxious that every student-athlete that applies himself or herself diligently has reasonable opportunity to succeed to graduation.

If Division III institutions are true to their advertising, we have nothing to fear by openness on this matter. Such a public posture will help to offset current and to forestall future vague and broad shotgun criticism of the type outlined earlier, which has been growing in intensity and, by and large for the wrong reasons, increasingly accepted as legitimate.

Second, with the changing composition of Division III and the increasing difficulties many Division III institutions are having because of demographic trends and declining Federal financial assistance, there may now be or in the future may be more institutions in Division III with unacceptable graduation rates than would be consistent with our current in-house and public image and philosophy. At the least, to the extent there is or may be a potential problem, there would be encouragement to take corrective action to the benefit of the students. The point is that it is not in our interests long run to simply hope that the issue will go away and that we will not be required eventually to prove what we advertise.

Division III eventually will face the same public scrutiny as institutions in Divisions I and II. Positive action on this issue by Divisions I and II will assure this to be the case. Winston Churchill once said words to the effect that he who sets the agenda wins the debate; and while in football there is validity in asserting that the best offense may be a good defense, not so in the political arena. And we are in the political arena. On matters of accountability, Division III is in a position, I believe, to set the agenda and lead by showing our good results on graduation rates. If our experiences should prove not as we would like, then we will be showing that we are taking corrective action before being forced to do so through broad-based media assertions that impact adversely on the many because of the abuses by a few.

In closing, let me speak to one final point. That is the contention that disclosure would place an unacceptable administrative burden on our institutions.

Not so. The data is available in the record, and the definitional problems that differentiate us from Divisions I and II can be overcome. Where an institution's records system is computerized, a relatively simple program will provide the necessary data for any reasonable report on graduation rates. In institutions where the records are not computerized, even hand generation of the data would not be very difficult. My institution is of comparable size and

complexity to most of the membership of Division III, and it was not so long ago that we compiled detailed retention statistics by hand.

Let us not hide behind a thin smoke screen. The first reporting format devised by the staff appeared daunting because it was essentially based on the model developed for Divisions I and II. There are definitional problems; but surely with a bit of time and imagination, a system that is relatively simple and attuned to Division III can be devised. We should not reject a worthwhile idea simply because it originated in Division I or II or was forced on them. Thank you.

Rev. William J. Byron (Catholic University): The Division III Subcommittee of the Presidents Commission is not opposed to the disclosure of graduation rates, but it is not inclined to jump in right from the beginning. The position that we have taken right from the beginning is sit back and wait for two years. Now, that is really based on three propositions. First, we prefer to wait until the definitions are worked out and the proper categories are developed. On the definitional issue, who is the student-athlete? Would a person who tries out and then drops off the team within a few weeks count as a student-athlete? How about a person who plays just one season? How about a person who transfers out in good standing after having played one sport and one semester? Do we have to put a tracer on those persons all the way through what is probably a five-year framework to see whether or not they graduated? There are definitional problems, and we would prefer to have the Division I and Division II institutions work those out.

The second point would be this. We do not track athletes as athletes through our admissions offices, registrar offices or our financial aid offices, so it is going to be a whole lot more difficult in Division III than in either I or II to generate the data. So the question is since we do not have readily available data, will it be expensive to get it? Probably will, and it surely is going to be more expensive if we are not really sure what the categories and the definitions are, so why don't we sit back and wait?

Point three is this. We will not be covered by the anticipated Federal legislation, which aims at recruited athletes receiving athletics grants-in-aid. There is no discussion in Washington about covering us under this proposed legislation. Why, therefore, should we extend, in effect, the reach of the anticipated Federal legislation? Would inclusion of Division III in this NCAA legislation right here at the beginning—the NCAA legislation that we would acknowledge is prompted by the threat of Federal legislation—would inclusion of Division III therein encourage even more federal intrusion and regulation?

Now, although we recognize that Division III is not problem free with regard to graduation rates, we do not think the problem is a major one, nor do we anticipate any adverse publicity as a result of the position that we recommend; and I repeat, the position is this. Let it move through as affecting Divisions I and II. Let them be so

many tracer bullets that we can observe and in the observation come up with the proper categories and even, indeed, prepare our information-generation mechanisms so that when and if we are included, it will be a whole lot simpler and less complex to get the data. Thank you.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I have one major contention with those who are in favor of disclosing graduation rates. I have heard lots of rhetoric this morning on the topic that we wish not to distinguish our student-athletes from the rest of the student body; and it would seem to me that by taking this step, we are perpetrating a major violation of the Division III philosophy, all of a sudden identifying these people, tracking them and making them something different than we want them to be.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): I am not sure it is at all a violation of our philosophy to show our athletes graduate at the same or better rate than nonathletes. You know, either they do or they don't. You know, I don't view it this way. We disclose ourselves each year on a state-wide form with all the private institutions, whether Division I, II or III.

[Note: A straw vote did not indicate an interest among the Division III delegates in pursuing legislation to moderate graduation-rate disclosure.]

Hosting NCAA Championships

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): Before we get into the discussion, I would beg your indulgence for a moment just to reiterate what has been said previously by some of the other Council members in acknowledging the fact that Al, under his leadership and his vice presidency, has continued in a vein that Ken Weller and Betty Kruczek and Judy Sweet started to bring to Division III, a kind of openness and responsiveness that we all think is extremely important. If you reflect back just four or five years, what it was like and the kind of tension that were in these meetings and the kind of response that we get now, I think it is an extremely, enormously positive experience for us to be able to discuss our issues in our own break-out sessions and to do it without any fear or paranoia. I think Al has done that in a remarkably fine manner. His two senior Council members, Bill Marshall and Mary Barrett, were, obviously, very supportive of that throughout their career in the Council, and they need to be acknowledged for that.

One of the things that, as Al indicated, you all suggested in previous meetings and indicated you had some interest in learning more about were national championships. You wanted to learn how they are hosted, the procedures involved and whether, indeed, there are problems in hosting these championships. There is, obviously, a lot of glory, reflection and prestige in doing so for your institution.

Obviously, there is a lot of hard work in preparation, time and commitment of human resources; and Al has done a very good job of selecting two people who have had experience in that area to dis-

cuss these issues with you as they might apply to you as you think about hosting championships in the future. It is my pleasure to introduce to you two gentlemen who have had extensive experience. Ralph Honderd from Calvin College has hosted about eight Division III basketball championships and also has been involved in some other sport championships at his institution. Walter Johnson from North Central College has had extensive experience in hosting Division III track championships at his institution.

Ralph Honderd (Calvin College): I would just like to give credit to Dave Tuck, the former athletics director, who actually did most of the work in hosting the championships that we had at Calvin. We had seven of them in basketball. We had two in track. We had one in softball and one in volleyball, and our women's athletics director, Doris Zuidema, was involved in those. We spent a little time talking about hosting and what it actually involved and so forth.

I think it makes a big difference what sport you are hosting, first of all. Now, I know that North Central, has hosted track, and that is probably much more work than many of the others. In basketball, we found out that there were some pluses and some minuses. First of all, I will talk about the pluses. That won't take a real long time. One of the pluses would be if your team was a national-caliber team and had a chance of going on and competing for the national championship, one of the top four. But there are no guaranties. Still that would be a real advantage, because you would not have to travel, students would not have to miss classes and so forth. That does not happen very often in the sport of basketball.

Another plus, and one that has been alluded to, is that your institution would receive recognition. I don't think that is a real big plus. I don't think that you receive a lot of recognition, but is nice. In the first year and so forth, it is very, very exciting, but now I will get to a couple minuses. Seems like more of you have hosted these things than I thought.

First of all, in basketball—I am going to speak to basketball now, because that is the one we have had probably the most experience with—it does disrupt classes for at least three days. No activity classes can be carried on in your facilities, plus recreational privileges are taken away from your students; and in our Division III philosophy, that is a consideration. It certainly does have a wearing effect on the staff, too. It is exciting the first year. It really is, and you are really enthusiastic about doing it. But by the end, you are saying, "We are glad it is finished," because in our situation, most of our coaches coach spring sports. It delays their opportunities to work with their teams and also their teaching, and it takes a lot of effort. It is really wearing.

I guess one of the biggest things, though, especially for me, and I was involved in a regional last year, was the forms that you have to fill out as far as guaranteeing what your receipts are going to be.

Well, I know that if we would be in the tournament that could be guaranteed. We would sell out and we would have a great looking

budget.

But as an athletics director, I am very worried when I see that I have to come up with about 75 percent of what I estimate the receipts will be. I don't want to lose money for my college, and that was a little scary. Now, maybe that has changed, and I hope it will be changed if it is not. We talked about it with a couple other AD's from the MIAA. Has a tournament ever been bought, especially in a regional, where you send in a real high guarantee so that you can play at home? You will be assured to play at home. I don't know. Hopefully not.

Then, too, hitting sponsors is part of it, trying to raise money for special things like banquets and so forth. You go to these people a couple times, and pretty soon they are getting a little bit sick of it, too. They say, "What do we really get out of this?" We say, "The prestige."

I guess I would like to just say a couple things as far as suggestions go. I would really like to see the estimate of receipts thrown out. I mean, you don't know. In basketball, we have had some pretty good crowds when we have had teams from around the area; but when we have teams from way out, the probability of us getting good crowds is not all that great.

I would like to see the site selected on such things as availability. What kind of facility do you have, availability of airport, accommodations and these type of things. Throw out the form so that you don't really get all worried about whether you are going to lose your school some money. I think, too, maybe a little bit more money for the host school. I know when we hosted the regionals last year, we made \$238. Now, that did not really cover the wear and tear on everything. Not that we want to get into the money game, but I think that you do have to at least make it worthwhile for the institution to hold a national championship.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): Well, interestingly enough, track is not that much different. As far as track and field is concerned, there are a number of things that go into planning, but I think some of those same things can be applied to any sport for which you host. Track and field tends to be longer in terms of the number of days involved, and it is a final right then and there. Thus, there are more teams involved, so a little more preparation.

I am going to go through some of the things that we have had to do at North Central in order to prepare to give you some idea of some of the solutions that we have come up with. I also will make some suggestions and just kind of throw them out at you and see where you go with them. In terms of track and field, it is about a six- to nine-month preparation period. This will be our fifth year of hosting the national championships. The things that are involved are support staff, finding volunteers. In track and field, that could be anywhere from 150 to 200 different people.

There is the time constraint on one's own program, in your own track and field program, that pulls away from the things that a

coach can do in order to make that program more successful. Limited access to facilities for your other students.

The fund-raising part is a big problem, especially after you have done it once or twice. Those same people really are not interested in hearing from you again, and depending on the policies of your institution, it may be more difficult through the administrative process, development, et cetera, to be able to go out individually as an athletics program and raise those funds. So that is one of the things that we have run into. Our development office does not like the idea of us going out and trying to find funds for the athletics department. They would prefer to do that kind of thing, and so it puts a financial restraint on us.

Other things that need to be taken into consideration are finding a host hotel, a meet headquarters, finding housing, finding people to organize that. Something as simple as an awards ceremony, you need four or five people to run that. Those are all things that come into play when you are in the planning process. Dealing with the vendors. There are only certain vendors that you can deal with, the NCAA licensed vendors. Well, that becomes somewhat of a disadvantage because you cannot go to your local vendors. You cannot go to the local sports shop and say, "Hey, I need 300, 400, 500 T-shirts for my officials. Why don't you give me the business and in return we will put an ad in the program for you" and have them possibly pay for some of the ad. We don't have that opportunity because we don't have the control over what vendor we can go to, at least locally.

The drug testing in track and field we feel is important, but you have to have about 60 to 70 couriers in order to make that thing work. So, those are more volunteers; and if you are an institution where school is not in session during this period, where are you going to find all these people? I am going to stop with the problems. Here are some of the things that possibly could be done to make it work a little more efficiently: Provide a general information or how-to-do book on handling national championships. There are enough people out here now who have done it often enough that through just a gathering of information, maybe the NCAA could provide us with a handbook, these are the steps that you have to go through in order to make this thing work. I think there is a scary thought of screwing it up. You don't want your institution to look bad, so you prefer not to do it, especially if you are coming behind an institution that did it very well. You just don't want to be in that situation.

If that could be provided for you, it might make it a little easier to make the thing work. In the handbook, I would include things like budget planning, obtaining volunteers, getting community support, finding advertising, fund raising, where and how to get equipment. That becomes a problem. An example: A pole vault pit will cost you \$6,800; and if you have the wrong pit at a national championships and someone gets hurt on that pit, you can be liable for

that. So that is something you have to take into consideration. A high jump pit will cost you \$4,200. Blocks cost \$300. Those are all things that come into play. Can you rent that equipment, and who can you rent it from?

I think there needs to be a flat amount that is made available based on averages of expenses from previous championships as a starting point. You could use it as a starting point for budget discussions, so that the money needed to propose the budget could be addressed with that issue in mind. If you have a flat amount based on what the averages have been and you want to discuss amounts of money you need to spend over that, that would be a good place to start. The way we have it set up now, there is no flat amount. You present. They decide whether they are going to accept or not, and then you have to deal with whatever you get. That makes it very difficult.

One of the things being involved in track that has been to our advantage is that there are coaches who can serve as officials for the national championships. So there are enough people there who are involved in the championships from around the country who can assist the host institution in putting it on.

Is this a special event or do we want just another event? You know, a Chevy GO is a nice car. It will get you there. But a BMW 735i, well, that will get you there in class and in style.

Gerald B. Lowrey (Emory University): I was hoping this was going to take a little more of a positive tenor. Seems like the advantages have been thin and the negatives have been like the Grand Canyon here. I speak as the athletics director at a school that has hosted 10 championships in the last five years. We do it and will continue to do it—we will be hosting one this year—because we feel that there are some real positives for us. I would just like to hit on some of those.

We feel that it is an opportunity to have some team building for our staff. We have a staff that gets involved in a number of different individual coaching responsibilities and at times pulls in opposite directions. We find that hosting a national championship calls upon everyone to pull together to pull it off correctly. And after the championship is over, there is often a feeling of having accomplished something that was worthwhile and a sense on the part of the team of being able to accomplish much more as a group.

A second advantage has to do with building campus and community support for our programs. In Atlanta, we are overshadowed to a certain extent by Division I programs at Georgia and Georgia Tech. Many of the people in the media think of Division III as being third rate or someplace off the scale. By bringing to our campus the best athletes in various sports in the nation in Division III, we can show that there is excellence in Division III sports and that there is an alternative to the Division I approach. It helps not only the community, but also our campus to see the value in the sports program that we offer.

A third opportunity or positive note would have to do with the fact that I feel that hosting a national championship is one of the best means of contributing to the professional development of a particular coach in a sport. There is nothing like shouldering the responsibility of putting on a national championship to really bring out the best in a coach if, in fact, it is there to be brought out. You very quickly learn whether or not this is something that is going to happen. Most of our coaches, in fact, have risen to the occasion, and they are much better people for having put on a national championship. They can participate in the national organizations in a way that is a little different after having coached a national championship.

Perhaps the most important reason that we do it—and I wish more of you would consider doing it—has to do with paying one's dues or shouldering one's responsibility to the overall organization to put on the very best championships we can. If we really want the best for our athletes, if we really want top Division III championships, then it is incumbent upon each one of us to be willing to shoulder part of the burden of providing those championships and doing the work necessary to have the quality experience that we expect for our athletes.

D. Kenneth Ober (Elizabethtown College): My observation from the two gentlemen that gave the report is that, obviously, they really love hosting championships because they have been doing them for so many years, and it is obvious to me that they have more negative reports than positive.

Elizabethtown College has hosted various championships, both regional and national championships, women's basketball, women's field hockey finals, soccer finals, softball regionals plus a few others. I have really found that hosting a national championship is a piece of cake. I don't see any minuses to it. I am not operating a track championship, but I feel that the positive side of hosting a national championship has been good for Elizabethtown College.

Naturally, we won two of them when we hosted them; but, on the other hand, when you realize that hosting them keeps your team at home, it keeps the spectators right there. For the amount of emphasis that our conference gets from it and from the amount of emphasis that the college would get from it, I see it as a very positive thing. There are so many items that were mentioned here. We get a really good publication from the NCAA on how to run a national tournament. If you read the information that is sent to you, it indicates everything that you should need, and you follow those items by item.

Running a championship is a piece of cake. I think that every school, if it has the facilities, should be in a situation where if should be able to offer I have offered to host championships where I had to submit a budget a year in advance, and that probably was the most frustrating, but the ones where I am told a week in advance that we are hosting the championship, I like that because

it is only a week. You work like crazy for a week, but you can get it done. That is what I think is a really big advantage.

What I heard today just really upsets me, that anyone can talk down hosting an NCAA Division III championship.

Ralph Hondred (Calvin College): I don't think we were talking down hosting. Otherwise, we would not have done it as often as we have. We just said there are some minuses that hopefully we can correct so that we don't have the problems and we don't have the burn-out. I think both of us hope to do it again sometime.

I hope we did not give you the idea that it is all negative. In fact, I did call the NCAA and put in for the 1992-93 basketball championships again, but I am saying that there are some things that can be improved. I think that is the tack that we were taking, not that it is a negative thing. It does have some advantages, but there are some things that, you know, could be done to help make it easier for the host school. That is what we were trying to get at. It was great, but maybe doing some things could make it even better. That is where we are coming from.

Marilyn A. Maurer (Kalamazoo College): I would like to speak from two perspectives. First of all, as a coach, I would like to say to the championships committee to send us to the best facility with the best accommodations. Worry less about moving us around the country and so forth. If some place has an ideal -183- facility and has plenty of hotels, motels and restaurants, please send us back there and let our athletes have the best situation for competition.

As an athletics director who has hosted some women's tennis championships, I would like to respond to what someone said about a coach hosting championships. I believe that was Emory, and they have done a wonderful job. I have been there for some of their championships, but we have found it works best if we don't expect the coach to host that championship, particularly if the coach is going to have athletes in the championship. We have found other people to put in charge of that, and I think it is best to allow the coach to coach her team or his team rather than expect double duty.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): Thank you very much. One of the points that you make is a very strong one about getting the best facility. I think that is always the top priority. However, when that responsibility falls on the same institution three or four years in a row or five years in a row, even though it is the best facility, there is a displacement factor, I think, that is extremely critical to that institution with regards to its support personnel and its programs. I think the NCAA has to be responsive to that. Otherwise, we would just beat down a good thing and exploit people.

Charles W. Winters (Gettysburg College): I was involved at a different institution in hosting the Division III Wrestling Championships. We were aware that we were going to have the championships a year ahead. It was at Cortland State University College the year prior. I was assistant athletics director; and because the athletics director was a wrestling coach at that time, most of that

responsibility fell on my shoulders.

The year before, I went with him on his budget at Cortland. I suggest to you that the Council might consider that when we know what institution is going to host next year's championship, that the NCAA pick up the cost for the administrators of the institution that is going to host it the following year to make that site visit and make the championship the following year a little bit better by the person running it having the opportunity to see what he is going to be responsible for.

Cortland has a very strong physical education program, but there were comments by one speaker that one problem you might have is where to get volunteers. We used hosting that championship as a very positive experience for physical education majors in all of the areas that were needed in putting on a championship. From an educational standpoint, I will agree that the students in those classes were not necessarily doing what was in the itinerary for that class, but the fact that they had the opportunity to work and prepare to host this championship I think was very rewarding for them in the long run.

Dean Burroughs (Salisbury State University): We have hosted in the past four basketball championships and regional championships in football, field hockey and softball; and we can identify with the pluses and minuses that have been brought out here today. I would like to say that whether you emphasize one over the other, whether it is a plus or a minus, I think depends on attitude, commitment and timing. As far as the attitude, one has to have a sense of humor and roll with the punches on many of these things. Then more pluses come about than minuses.

And commitment, like anything else, must be there from the beginning. You decide to do it. You get the bid. You are committed and your staff is committed. Then more pluses come about than minuses.

And then the timing. You hold an outdoor championship and everything goes wrong. It rains. The officials are late. The timing was bad, and, you know, you put it in perspective again and treat it just as it is. So, no, it is not a perfect; it is never a perfect situation.

I think nobody is in it to make money and to build mammoth facilities and benefit that way, but it would be helpful to have a commitment knowing that it is not a financial burden when you do host.

John D. Galaris (Salem State): Just a couple thoughts on championships: One of the things, I think, the committee should consider, particularly in the earlier rounds and right through to the finals where possible, is moving championships around. It has been our experience that where we have hosted the same championship three and four years in a row, it is great for the institution. However, I am not sure it is good for the sport in the particular region, and that is just a personal thing that I have observed over the years.

The other point one of my colleagues was making recently was

that when the teams get to the final four in various sports, we limit our traveling parties. That is all legislated. However, it can be very expensive for institutional representatives to attend and pay their own way. So, some thought might be given to reimbursing the athletics directors' expenses so that they can attend the final four, particularly where many institutions cannot really afford to send the supplementary people.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I just wanted to mention one of the things that you need to keep in mind, and I am sure we all do. We are the NCAA, and we as a group has just fallen into, not by luck, but by skill and negotiations, a significant amount of income. What I am suggesting and what I believe my colleagues are suggesting is that hosting can be a positive thing. We need the support, and so what we are suggesting is jump in there and host, but support us in trying to get the -189- additional funds to make it an easier proposition. That is really what we are talking about. A lot of the headaches could be eliminated if we had the support, both financial and nonfinancial support, to make it happen.

I think North Central will continue to host, too, but I think the opportunities to host at other institutions exist if those institutions could see the support necessary to make it happen.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: We have had the opportunity to host three national championships in St. Louis, and I always looked at it as being a privilege to host one of the national championships. I agree with the others who spoke positively about hosting and the responsibility of each institution to share that burden. The most recent championship we hosted was volleyball, and I have to applaud the NCAA Volleyball Committee, because they did have a handbook. Not only was the handbook available for the national championship, but it also was available for the regional championship, and it was very, very helpful to have that information, and it is relatively easy to follow the plan that was submitted.

I would like to share a couple of thoughts with you. All sports committees prepare a handbook for the administration of a Division III championship. Two, each institution after it hosts a championship should be provided an evaluation and/or recommendation form for future championships. Third, support should be given to the thought of sending an observer, for example, the institution that is going to host the championship the following year.

Four, in terms of the NCAA Division III Men's Basketball Championship, I would hope that that championship could be held on one of the campuses of the final four teams. I don't think at that point that it becomes a burden to the host institution, and I think you will have great deal of spirit and great crowd support.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: The NCAA does not require any institution to guarantee an amount of income in terms of hosting the national championships. That is no longer on the books.

Mr. Carzo: Are you not required to guarantee 75 percent of the budget?

Mr. Schael: No. That is a misconception. Secondly, I think it really is an honor. I talked about the privilege of hosting the championship, and it is a meaningful experience for our student-athletes to have the opportunity to play at home on their campus. Believe me, NCAA championships are something very, very special and very meaningful, and it is a lot more fun to play at home than on the road.

OPEN FORUM

Mr. Van Wie: As has been our tradition over the past several years, our final forum today is going to be an open forum. There has been some concern expressed at lunch and during our break that we continue, for example, and discuss Proposal No. 30. So, at this time, it is a pleasure to introduce another friend, Mary Barrett. We call her the eyes and ears of the ECAC, and it is a pleasure to have her up here today hosting this forum.

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): Open forum does not mean debate. It means speak up. We have some people who have indicated to us that they would like to speak to some of the areas of interest that perhaps we are facing tomorrow. As the Division III Steering Committee, we also would welcome any input that you would like to make about the agendas for 1990.

George Andrews (Oberlin College): Many of the points on both sides of the issue surrounding Proposal No. 30 already have been raised. As I have been listening, there seems to be general approval of the concept of reducing the time pressures imposed by practice, travel and contests on students' academic pursuits, though more fortunately situated colleges in New England may not be experiencing such difficulties as those west of the Hudson.

I share the Presidents Commission's concerns that were articulated by Father Byron this morning. But rather than repeating statements made earlier today, I would like to bring to your attention relevant portions of a statement developed by the Academic Review Committee of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association earlier in the fall. I will quote directly from that statement.

"The Academic Review Committee believes that this proposal would strengthen the academic performance of student-athletes. A reduction in the length of playing and practice seasons would provide additional time and energies for academic pursuits. A reduction in the number of competitive events and length of season in the sport of basketball would more nearly confine the sport to a single academic term, so that more emphasis could be placed on academic activities in other term or terms. The overall positive academic impact of this proposal will include a message to all student-athletes that their studies are of utmost importance relative to their practice activities. The Academic Review Committee strongly endorses this Presidents Commission proposal."

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I would like also

to speak to Proposal 30 and echo, I think, the sentiments of several members of the Presidents Commission who are here today and who have been listening to the concerns raised by our colleagues. I think that there is considerable consensus about Proposition 30, and then I think there is a problem. I hope I might offer a simple recommendation that would overcome the problem and allow us in the main to go forward tomorrow in support of this.

My colleague from Oberlin has just indicated where I do also think the consensus exists. It appears that an October 1 conditioning date is nonobjectionable. It appears that a November 1 practice date is not objectionable, and it appears that a reduction to 25 games is not objectionable in the main. The problem, it appears, is that December 1 start. In your handbook, it appears on Page 30 as Part F, and the recommendation that I would make is that we strike Part F, thereby allowing each institution and each conference to design the best way in which to schedule its 25 games within the constraints of a November 1 practice date and an October 1 conditioning date.

If we do that, it seems to me that we will have made substantial progress on this very fundamental question of reducing the time pressures on our students, and I just want to hasten to add that I think we are going to be watched very carefully on Proposition 30. I believe the media, I believe our faculty members, I believe our trustees are asking the question: Are we going to strike a better balance than we have had on this question of how we impose on our athletes demands on their time? And, I believe this is a way to move forward progressively.

I think that if we out of Division III might come forward in support of striking Part F and retaining the balance, we will have made good headway. It would be helpful if there might be at least a straw vote to see whether that seemingly would help the resolution to this question.

Ms. Barrett: Fine. All those who would favor striking Section F, would you just raise your paddles so we have an indication? Those who would be opposed. You have your answer.

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): I would just like to make a couple of comments. Someone said it earlier today about let's not get Division III wrapped up in Division I issues. I would just hope that the Division III representatives on the Presidents Commission can use a rationale that is not questionable when it comes to Division III issues. Extensively, the American Institutes for Research data have been quoted; and they are the rationale for Proposition 30. It has nothing to do with Division III. I don't know where the evidence or the data is that supports the thoughts that I am hearing.

They talk about all the problems, the time demands on intercollegiate athletes. I have not heard any complaints from any of our student-athletes, and when we travel around, I have not heard any complaints from your student-athletes in terms of time demands.

They seem to be making it. The type of students we have involved in our programs are the type who are paying their own way for an education. They are very serious about getting their degree, more so about getting their education.

Athletics is something they enjoy, and it is part of the reason they selected a particular institution to attend. Give them the opportunity to participate. Now, we talk about playing seasons, and I am reminded of No. 103 that was presented by MIT. We talked about No. 103. We talked about the tennis players; and if I remember correctly, earlier this morning we said let's just not take tennis. Let's take all the sports, review it over the next eight to ten months, come back, submit legislation and vote on a whole package. Maybe individual sports should be treated differently. Perhaps they should have 26 weeks and team sports only 21 weeks. Perhaps the same thing could be said about Proposition 30. Why just football and basketball? How about ice hockey?

The biggest demand on college athletes today in terms of men's athletics is baseball. Most of us don't have lights on our campus. We have to start playing at 1:00 in the afternoon or 3:00 or play a five-inning game, not a seven or nine. So hopefully, we can look at the whole issue. Thank you.

Roger H. Martin (Moravian College): I am also a member, as David is, of the Presidents Commission. I would like just very briefly to set No. 30 in a different context. Whether we like it or not, and there might be some people who don't like it, tomorrow we are going to be part of a national reform movement in intercollegiate athletics, which the Presidents Commission is taking a leading part in. I personally believe that Division III by precept and example has played and will even more importantly play a very important role in being an example for Divisions I and II as to what can happen in intercollegiate athletics. I urge all of you to support the Presidents Commission on this issue.

The problem is not the December 1 starting point. I think David's proposal, which we just supported, is a good way out of that. Nor is the problem 25 games. Many of us play fewer than 25 games. The issue tomorrow is whether we are going to stand in unison with a group of reforming presidents, especially from Divisions I and II, who are trying to make a change. I think that if we vote against Proposition No. 30 tomorrow, I think we are going to let those people down. I encourage you to vote with them.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Mr. Van Wie: As we come to the conclusion of a long day, just entering the room is a former student-athlete from a Division III school, a graduate of a Division III school who it has been my pleasure to work with over the last three years. I believe he has a real understanding of what this division is all about and the principles and philosophies that we care about and espouse. This is not part of the formal program, but as chair, I would invite our executive

director just to come to the podium and be recognized for a minute.

Richard D. Schultz (NCAA): Well, as unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, I do appreciate an opportunity just to make a couple of remarks. First of all, I want you to know, and sometimes you don't appreciate this, how good the leadership is that you have in Division III and on the Division III Steering Committee. They do a tremendous job of representing your interests and all interests. We know that there is much diversity in Divisions I and II, but we also know there is a little bit of diversity in Division III. And you have excellent representation. That is important, and I urge you to continue to elect qualified people to represent you on the NCAA Council.

Having had a Division III background and I feel having a good understanding and having spent a fair amount of time with Division III conferences, meeting with them in these last three years, there is one thing that I notice occasionally. I think it is something that you have to overcome. Sometimes you feel like you are sisters of the poor and are kind of overlooked. Don't take that attitude. There is a uniqueness about Division III. You have something special in Division III that the other two divisions don't have, and you should not look on yourselves as second-class citizens. You are a very, very important part of intercollegiate athletics and this Association. In many cases, you are a good conscience for the other members of the Association, and I think especially now with what we have been able to negotiate that we will be able to put Division III even in a better position to enjoy the numerous championship events that the Association offers.

I also would hope—and I understand clearly the reason for withdrawing the legislation to deal with graduation rates in Division III—but I would hope that this body would come out of this meeting with some statement about future support for graduation rates. I say that simply because I am comfortable that that will pass in Division I and Division II, but I am very concerned about the jurisdictional issue of who controls graduation rates and the reporting of those and who controls the regulation of intercollegiate athletics. I think we have a defensible position by saying that Division III does not provide financial aid based on athletics ability, but I still think it would be a good reaffirmation if this body would say that it is going to study and devise legislation in the future that would fit Division III and would fit the graduation-report criteria. I think that would help us very much in heading off any future Federal legislation.

With that in mind, let me compliment you on the way you do business. Hold your head high. You are a very, very important part of the NCAA and higher education.

Mr. Van Wie: Dick's request puts us in a rather awkward position. Dick, because of, I guess, our uniqueness, this body has already taken a position that says we don't really feel that disclosure of graduation rates in Division III is something we want to do.

It will be up to the steering committee to again look at this issue if this body would want to change its position at the present time.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I wonder if we might reflect on the last comment that was made by Father Byron to the effect that coming out of the Presidents Commission, we wanted to observe the implementation of Divisions I and II for the first two years and in light of that make a judgment about how we might go forward.

That is a straddle, but it does reflect clearly where the Presidents Commission came down; and it seems to me that it does not deny nor disregard the concerns raised by our executive director. I think it does reflect the sentiment both of Father Byron and of the Division III presidents on the Presidents Commission.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): It also should go on record that there are institutions that may be studying this issue and devising their own graduation-rate records or documents during the two-year interval that we are speaking to at this point.

James J. Whalen (Ithica College): I had the privilege to write to all of the presidents of the colleges and universities in the NCAA encouraging them to support the legislation presented by the Presidents Commission because I thought it was very important. I think we are hiding our heads in the sand.

I testified before Sen. Bradley and Sen. Kennedy, and I had some good company with Richard Schultz. And if you think that 300-plus colleges and universities are going to be exempted in the eyes of the Congress and the public, I think that is wrong.

I have a second position. Two years ago, I proposed that we get in there and adopt Proposition 48, as well. And I did not have any better success than my good friend George had today, but I want to say something about Division III. This is a diverse group. We were talking about tennis teams at MIT, a very select group. You go to the other end of the spectrum, and we have large number of individuals participating in sports where we do need legislation, and we should not shy away from it.

We are not Simon Pure in Division III, and we should stop wrapping ourselves in this cloak of academic and athletics integrity. We really should look to the possibility that if we don't legislate, if we don't take on some of these things, we will end up with some of the same problems that have beset Division I.

We call ourselves the conscience of the NCAA. I would like very much for us to examine our own conscience to see if, in fact, we really are—in Division III—the conscience of the NCAA. We had better be. It may be the last bastion to help Dick and the others.

Mylla Urban (Carleton College): If it is appropriate, I would suggest that our straw vote earlier this afternoon be considered only that, and that we do direct our steering committee to look quickly and carefully into the possibility of legislation to allow a means of reporting our graduation rates in Division III. I would say this partially to support the Presidents Commission and to respond

to the comments just made and also to put this forward as a positive position that is supportable in the sense that I believe our division will have nothing to lose but a lot to gain by such a disclosure.

I would hope that the legislation would allow us to do this in the least painful way and perhaps on a basis less than annual. But, nonetheless, that would have us join in this effort to add to the integrity of academics and athletics in the NCAA.

[Note: This was considered a motion and was seconded.]

Rev. William J. Byron (Catholic University): Quickly and carefully, I am beginning to have some problems about procedure here. We did have a lot of discussion. It was scheduled discussion. We were standing there waiting for people to come up and speak. There were none forthcoming. We took action that was consistent with the recommendations from the Presidents Commission, an action that by no means foreclosed on the possibility of eventual legislation.

Indeed, we talked about a two-year frame, and we want to do it carefully. I don't feel under any pressure to do it quickly, and I don't think we should be coerced into doing it quickly as we are ready to adjourn the meeting.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I concur with Father Byron. I don't feel embarrassed about the discussion and the debate that took place earlier. It was thoughtful. It was concise. The body came to a decision, and I don't appreciate being rushed into taking a position at the 12th hour by someone who did not rise to the occasion at the time.

Richard P. Traina [Clark University (Massachusetts)]: I support the views expressed by Father Byron and by Bill Marshall. It occurs to me that whatever is decided by way of strategy by the steering committee, that it is important to keep before the whole membership and before the press outside the Association that so long as we are not providing aid above need for student-athletes, so long as we are not profiting from gate and television receipts, so long as we don't have to worry about people associated with our institutions assisting students "under the table," and so long as we are not in any way tied with a system of professional athletics in America, we are very, very different from Division I. I agree with Bill that we should not feel apologetic about the character of our discussion today. Thank you.

Jim Gasso (University of California, Santa Cruz): Before we make a decision, I want to say that we always double-check before we make the final decision on anything. We need to support the Presidents Commission on this. We have to show and prove to everybody that Division III kids are graduating. There is no big deal about if they are or not. Let's prove to everybody that they are graduating. So let's reconsider, and let's take another quick vote to prove that we are supporting that amendment. I have not heard that anybody is going to disapprove of what we want to do.

Mr. Van Wie: All we really are saying, or the way I understand it

is, that we are encouraging the steering committee to pursue this issue. We are not making any decisions. All this motion does is encourage the steering committee. The straw vote that we took, and it was strictly a straw vote—I made that clear—was that this group was not interested. Now, we have a motion that says that the steering committee should pursue it. There is no decision being made. What the conclusion will be of the steering committee or of this body in the future is not the issue right now.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): I hesitate to speak again on this subject, but I guess I have some degree of difficulty understanding why we seem unwilling to have the Council pursue the matter to see whether or not something might be devised that we could agree on later. It might take a year. It might take two years. There is no assurance or any reason to think that anything could get through that would not be acceptable to this body or that anything could be brought to this body on this subject given the division here unless there is good cause to do so and which likely would receive support. To stick our heads in the sand and say let's not even look at it for two years does not seem very reasonable to me.

Patricia A. Rogers (University of New York, Albany): I would like to offer a friendly amendment that the word "quickly" be struck from the motion.

[The Amendment was accepted, and the motion passed.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Van Wie: Rocco, I think you can see that there is a definite division.

If I can just have your attention for a couple more minutes. As we come to the conclusion of today's business session, you, the delegates, have had the opportunity to discuss issues, debate the merits of proposed legislation, had the opportunity to criticize or praise or sit silently by and observe, but regardless, the opportunity has been afforded you because you are a part of this forum. To me, that is very important.

In the next minute or two, I would like to share some of my biases with you after serving on the steering committee for four years and acting as your Division III vice-president for the last two years. Discussion and debate have become distinguishable factors of our Division III business session. To me, it will be a sad day when we meet only to act on legislation. Progress can and will take place only when the membership is willing to take an active role in this forum, and you have expressed that today. You have taken part in this forum. Open communication with the membership was a goal of mine, and I believe significant progress has been made in this area. Where I have failed, I apologize. Fortunately, you have been more than diligent, and I emphasize that, more than diligent in letting me know of your concerns by cards, letters and phone calls. And I appreciate it.

Allow me the opportunity to read you a paragraph from Elias Wonder. This may be a first at an NCAA business session, the reading of prose. Who is Elias Wonder? I am not really sure, but I believe this short paragraph contains a message for those who attempt to provide leadership to this most diversified group, and, as I said earlier, Dick, I think there is more diversity in Division III than Division I.

"A bird gave me a message once. No, damn it, I don't mean that no damn bird spoke or anything like that. It was an old crow, and it was in the middle of the highway, just sitting there black as hell, just glaring at me, those glaring eyes drowning me in their blackness. No matter where I moved, it moved. Then it took off into the trees, leaving a single black feather on the highway. Finally, I understood it was a messenger, and this is what it told me. There is common ground."

There is a lesson to be learned from serving on the Division III Steering Committee, the Division III Championships Committee and the Executive Committee, and that is that there is common ground for diversity of opinion. There must be common ground to serve the needs of the smallest liberal arts school to the largest state school that attempt to live by the Division III philosophy. Because there is common ground does not mean there is not room for strong opinions and biases. Anyone who has served with me for the past four years knows that I strongly oppose multidivision classification and how it compromises the Division III philosophy. To read in the Sunday's sport section that another Division I school playing Division III football again has dominated the Division III football championships makes me madder than hell. It is times like that that I would like to shoot that old crow and forget about the common ground, but until the membership removes multidivisional classification, I will have to accept the common ground.

Common ground can be extended in this organization beyond divisional structure. One of the challenges facing this Association in the 1990s, and I believe this very strongly, is whether this Association as it now is constructed will survive. I think that is an issue that has to be discussed in the future. Will this Association survive?

In the next six months, as you have heard many times at this Convention, the leadership of the Association will decide how much common ground Division II and Division III will have on that highway called the NCAA. As you know, the Association has just signed a billion-dollar contract with CBS to televise the Division I basketball tournament and 16 other NCAA tournaments over a seven-year period. How that money is divided will send a message loud and clear not only to the academic community, but the general public as a whole about what the priorities of this Association are and do we in Divisions II and III share that common ground.

Wil Bailey, past president of this Association, has stated that one of the fundamental purposes of this Association is its champion-

ships. If a fundamental purpose of this Association is championships, then all championships in Division II and Division III should be fully funded, meaning full transportation and a per diem that covers basic expenses. Progress has been made in this area in the past two years in that we have paid full transportation and a \$25 per diem from the block grant. With the new TV contract, and as full-fledged members of the Association, full transportation for all participants, coaches and AD's, as was mentioned earlier, a \$50 per diem should be paid. The fact that we want to share in John Thompson's and Bobby Knight's pot of gold does not mean that we should change course and chase the Division I rainbow. Let us continue to demonstrate that Division III student-athletes can compete, can excel and, yes, even enjoy the athletics experience while simply playing for the trophy.

Division III, in my opinion, is the conscience of the Association, regardless of what some prophets of doom may say. As the conscience of the Association, we must continue to be heard, not only in the NCAA, but on our individual campuses. We must have common ground, a common ground where athletics administrators; faculty reps, who I consider extremely important, and the presidents work in concert to see that the athletes on our campus have the richest possible experience.

A partnership of athletics administrators, both men and women; faculty reps willing to take responsibility, and active oversight—and I underline the word active—by presidents involvement would go a long ways toward maintaining integrity on our campus. If that integrity is demanded on each of our campuses, the NCAA Manual would shrink in size—that would be a blessing—and quickly gather dust.

The direction of our programs must be established on our campuses and in our conferences. The direction cannot come from the media or the fan in the stand and not the staff in Kansas City. We are the educators, and we are responsible. Yes, I agree with that old crow. There must be common ground, and that common ground must provide the best possible educational experience for those young men and women who participate in our intercollegiate programs.

We are adjourned.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.]

Division I Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1990

The Division I business session was called to order at 10 a.m., with B. J. Skelton, Clemson University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Skelton: Will you, please, take your seats. It is time to begin our session.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles). Yesterday in the business session, there was a motion made and approved to move Proposal Nos. 27 and 28 ahead of 26. I believe that that was done on the basis of inaccurate information with regard to the rules of the Association. Proposal No. 27 would eliminate Proposition 42, which was passed at the last Convention, and which has not yet gone into effect and, therefore, would return us to the status quo. Proposition No. 26 would amend Proposition No. 42 and would be a departure from the status quo.

Proposal No. 26 has been developed after very substantial discussion by the Presidents Commission, and I believe that it should be heard first. I would move that it be reordered to come before Proposal Nos. 27 and 28.

[The motion was seconded and approved, 215-89.]

Partial Qualifier—Division I

Mr. Young: Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would now move the adoption of Proposal No. 26—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I have moved Proposal 26—1, Mr. Chair, in order to clarify a problem that existed in 26 as it was written initially. No. 26—1, which is in the material that you have in regard to the additional amendments, would in effect define what was included in the initial proposal as a recruited athlete. In the previous proposal, this applied to any student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution. Because that raised some substantial questions, the Presidents Commission revisited that issue yesterday and is now recommending 26—1, which in effect defines what that was intended to mean. That is included in the last three lines.

If the prospect received an official paid visit from the institution or if the prospect was visited at the prospect's home by a member of the institution's coaching staff, this is the level of recruitment

required in order for a person to be counted under this provision. I recommend this to you on behalf of the Presidents Commission, Mr. Chair.

Douglas Kahn (University of Michigan): If I understand the amendment, it says that if even institutional funds came from the athletics department, and there had not been the visitation that is described, the person would not be a counter. If that is so, I have a little trouble understanding why that person wouldn't be a counter.

Mr. Young: You have to look at Proposal No. 26 now in the context of the new interpretation, which has been prepared to be commented on when we get to No. 26. Under the new interpretation, which was made by the Council at the urging of the Presidents Commission, the funds that provide the support could not come from the athletics department. The person would count, however, if he was a recruited athlete and was provided institutional aid. All this does is to define what a recruited athlete is.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I would like an interpretation of No. 26—1. If a youngster from the city of Los Angeles walks on to the campus at UCLA at his own expense, walks in to the coach's office and discusses the possibility of coming maybe to UCLA, and then is referred to the institutional aid office or financial aid office, and the package is worked up, does that youngster count as would the youngster who comes to University of Pittsburgh and pays his way?

Mr. Skelton: That would not be an official visit, so that would not meet the requirement here. I would say that this would not be a counter.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chair, the intention here on the part of the Presidents Commission was to adopt the standard that would cover at least all of the instances which we could see yesterday with help from the staff in order to really close the gap on this. It may be that is one. But the expectation was that no one would really be recruited in the context that we intended if he wasn't visited by someone from the coaching staff or didn't come to the university on a paid visit. I think that it may very well be that the circumstances Mr. Paterno describes would fall outside of the provision, but we were trying to come up with the standard that would deal certainly in most all cases with the problem as it was expressed to us.

Mr. Skelton: We may have a problem here in that this one is too clear. You either have an official visit or a visit in the home.

Mr. Paterno: That is exactly my problem. If it is going to be interpreted clearly as it is written, then, I think we have an opportunity now to recruit nonqualifiers by telephone or by other means get them on the campus and not have them counted. I am sure that is not what the Presidents Commission wants.

Lawrence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I think what Coach Paterno was getting at is exactly the point of this type of legislation. We now are redefining the term prospective or recruited student-athlete specifically for one item. It is a very dangerous

precedent for us to be setting. The number of instances increases for the recruited athlete to be visited not in the athlete's home but in the coach's home, in the high school. For local athletes, an unpaid visit is a very simple task. You open up a tremendous interpretation argument of what a recruited athlete is. We simply must pass 26 as proposed and hope in good faith that the legislative services department will come up with the interpretation that deals with what Chancellor Young is trying to accomplish.

[Proposal No. 26—1 (Page A-27) was defeated by Division I, 107-208, one abstention, roll call.]

Billy M. Seay (Louisiana State University): On behalf of the Southern Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 26—3.

[The motion was seconded.]

We believe that this would improve our ability to enforce the legislation and keep up with which young people we should count.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): No. 26—3, the partial qualifier, proposes to make the individual a counter at the time he practices or plays or participates in intercollegiate competition. Our proposal would be either/or with No. 26, thereby clarifying the entire issue that coach Paterno brought up; because this would make the individual, if both of these passed, a counter either if he has an official visit or there is a visit in the prospect's home, or at a later date if he participates by practicing or playing.

This gives us the best of both areas as to making this individual a counter. I realize that No. 26—3 does not make him a counter the first year as is the Presidents Commission's desire to do so, but does make him a counter at the time he actually participates or practices.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I would like an interpretation, I guess, of the effect of Proposal No. 26—3 on 26. If I might state what I assume it would be, given the previous explanation, it would be that an athlete would be counted if the prospect received an official paid visit from the institution, or if the prospect was visited at the prospect's home by a member of the institution's coaching staff; or in the event he had not been so recruited, he would count when the student-athlete participated in an institutional practice session or represented the institution against outside competition. Is that correct?

Mr. Skelton: That is correct.

Douglas Kahn (University of Michigan): Since No. 26-1 failed, does that mean now that No. 26—3 means that the student-athlete counts only in the circumstance where the athlete either participates in a practice or plays in a game. Is that the thrust now that No. 26—1 has failed?

Mr. Skelton: That is correct.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I now urge the membership, since the failure of No. 26—1, strongly to support No. 26—3 in order to clarify the administration of this proposal. Otherwise, the individual is a counter the moment he walks onto your campus,

whether or not you gave him one ticket to one game a year ago. All of a sudden, he is a counter at that moment, and you can be in violation of the NCAA maximum limitations on scholarships without ever knowing it. I strongly urge you, regardless of how you vote later on 26, to support 26—3 in order to clarify the administration of this proposal.

Lawrence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): This only further points up how ludicrous No. 26 is in the first place. Now, we have had a situation where we have legislation to make this person a counter and we are going to propose an amendment to not count them. Why are we proposing they be counted in the first place?

I would suggest that the amendment negates the intent of 26, although I understand what Mr. Kramer is saying about the danger in it. I think we must rely on staff to come up with the interpretation to fulfill Chancellor Young's intent of 26 initially.

Delegate: I would like to ask a question, please. The defeat of No. 26—1 restores to the original No. 26 the deleted wording "who was recruited by the awarding institution." It leaves that as a part of No. 26. Does that mean that the passage of No. 26—3 still is an either/or with the undefined "who was recruited by the original awarding institution"?

Mr. Skelton: I think this only directs the point as to when the student-athlete becomes a counter. This is not an either/or.

Delegate: Well, the original No. 26 provides that a student who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives aid shall be a counter. It doesn't say when. It says shall be counter.

Mr. Skelton: It tells you when if 26 is passed.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I have a question. If we do not pass No. 26—3, is my interpretation correct that if the youngster comes to an institution and receives nonathletics aid, practices after his first year, he doesn't count unless we pass No. 26—3? I am not quite sure on that. If that is the case, then I think we must pass No. 26—3.

Mr. Skelton: Was he recruited?

Mr. Paterno: He was not recruited. Does he count?

Mr. Skelton: He is a nonrecruited athlete? Nonrecruited would not count until he plays, or she plays.

Mr. Paterno: He could practice; but until he plays, he could come in as a new recruit and receive institutionalized aid based on need, not athletically related, and spend one year as a redshirt and play his three years, is that correct? I think we need to rule on this.

Mr. Skelton: No. 26—3 deals with recruited student-athletes.

Mr. Paterno: As I understand it, No. 26—3 does deal with recruited athletes, and it does deal with counting whether they are recruited or not recruited. That is my problem. If I am wrong, I am wrong.

Mr. Skelton: That is not correct.

[Proposal No. 26—3 (Page A-27) was defeated by Division I, 158-162, three abstentions.]

Stanley B. Sheriff (University of Hawaii): I voted on the prevailing side for the issue and I would like to move that No. 26—1 be reconsidered.

[The motion was seconded.]

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): We are now in a position where the athletics department is vulnerable if a prospective student who is recruited in a very informal manner early in the process later comes to the university and receives any type of institutional financial aid without the knowledge of the athletics department. That person becomes a counter regardless of whether the maximum financial aid has been awarded. It is imperative that we go back and reconsider this proposal so that the athletics department is not vulnerable to the students coming on in that manner.

[A motion to reconsider Proposal No. 26—1 (Page A-27) was defeated by Division I, 142-179, roll call.]

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): During the 1989 NCAA Convention, Proposal No. 42 was adopted for the purpose of eliminating the partial-qualifier provision effective August 1, 1990. Since its adoption, the merits of this proposal have been the subject of considerable public debate.

One primary concern regarding this proposal is the effect it has on the opportunity for individuals who currently are considered recruited partial qualifiers to receive institutional financial assistance that is unrelated to the recipient's athletics ability.

If the 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 is not modified or rescinded, one of its effects would be to eliminate the opportunity for some individuals who heretofore have been considered partial qualifiers from receiving institutional financial assistance. That is, they could not receive either athletics or nonathletics assistance.

The NCAA Presidents Commission has considered at length the effects of the adoption of the 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 and believes that while the intent of the proposition has substantial merit, its effect on the opportunity for certain individuals to receive institutional financial aid is indeed unfortunate; and we believe unintended. Accordingly, the Presidents Commission is sponsoring Proposal No. 26 in order to retain the partial qualifier in Division I for purposes of addressing the issue of providing financial assistance to such individuals.

The Commission believes Proposal No. 26 would address this concern effectively. Part A would permit a recruited partial qualifier to receive institutional financial assistance based upon need, consistent with institutional and conference regulations. In addition, please note that contrary to the initial interpretation, which was circulated but not in agreement with those circulated today, the official interpretation is that the student's financial assistance may not be funded from the athletics department. Therefore, Proposal No. 26 would retain the academic incentives that are inherent in the Association's initial legislative eligibility without devas-

tating financial side effects that the 1989 Proposal No. 42 would create.

Finally, Part B of Proposal No. 26 specifies that in the sports of football and basketball, recruited partial qualifiers who receive institutional financial assistance shall count toward the maximum financial awards limitation in the applicable sport. The Commission believes that this legislative provision is necessary to discourage member institutions from stockpiling an unfair number of partial qualifiers in the highly competitive sports of football and basketball by holding football and basketball programs accountable for the financial assistance awarded to partial qualifiers, and it would encourage such athletics programs be committed to the academic as well as the athletics success of such students.

We believe that this modification of the 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 will retain the desired effect of strengthening the current initial-eligibility standards of Division I while permitting the awarding of financial assistance that enables the affected individual to attend the collegiate institutions of their choice. We urge your support for this proposal.

Robert J. Myslik (Princeton University): Is it in order at this time for somebody who voted on the prevailing side of Proposition 26—3 to make a motion for its reconsideration?

Mr. Skelton: That would be in order.

Mr. Robert Myslik: I so move.

[The motion was seconded and approved, 192-133, roll call.]

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): Proposal No. 26—3 is not, in my opinion, in the best interest of the students because it allows institutions basically to stockpile partial qualifiers and freshmen, not count them, and basically to say that if you survive, we will be happy to put you on the team the second year. In terms of the athletics programs, this may be a positive thing but in terms of the student, if we are concerned about the student as an academic person, then I think that this motion should be denied.

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): This issue again points up the fault with the original No. 42. What we need to do is to vote 27 and get back to our five-year study of Proposition 48. I would urge defeat of this as well.

Paul Hardin (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I speak in favor of this amendment under reconsideration. Although I recognize the theoretical danger of stockpiling under this amendment, I think we have to adopt some measure of trust in the good faith of our institutions. I think that if we don't vote this amendment, we may lose No. 26, which I think is terribly important. We should not lose Proposition 42, and we should not lose No. 26. I support voting in favor of 26-3. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 26—3 (Page A-27) was approved, 189-136, one abstention, roll call, after a motion to reconsider was approved.]

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-26) was approved by Division I as

amended by No. 26—3 Final vote on No. 26 was 258-66, one abstention, roll call.]

Partial Qualifier—Division I

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

I rise to ask the Convention to vote in support of Proposal No. 27. I believe that we can eliminate the confusion that we have had in the last few minutes on this particular proposal. I wish to present the following rationale for the decision of Proposal No. 42. First, it has been said that Proposal No. 42 closed the loophole in Proposition 48 by prohibiting any financial assistance to partial qualifiers. Now, that assertion is incorrect.

I think that the Convention needs to keep in mind that 48 was debated long, hard and a lot of thought went into it. Also keep in mind that in considering No. 48 there was concern about the use of tests scores for admission to college; and at the time, the Convention deliberately, methodically decided that we would reach a compromise and that compromise was that partial qualifiers would receive some financial aid. I would contend that this is not a loophole, that this was part of 48.

If you recall, the original proposal was changed so that partial qualifiers could receive financial assistance. This compromise left the door of opportunity open for those who do not meet the requirements of 48. In fact, a vast majority of the research showed that tests were discriminatory; and that was another factor in modifying the original proposal. These factors have not changed. Proposal No. 42 is inconsistent with the basic concept of opportunity. Proposal No. 42 is inconsistent with the original objectives of the original proposal. For this reason, you should vote for 27.

Secondly, the NCAA will conduct a five-year study to determine the impact that Proposition No. 48 has on student-athletes. There is growing evidence, and I think I mentioned it yesterday, that 48 is beginning to have a positive impact on the high-school student. Now, the study will show on all student-athletes receiving grants-in-aid in Division I and Division II institutions and will consider the partial qualifiers, and the subgroup of this population, to determine in detail the progress over five years of their eligibility. It will not be until 1991 that complete data are available on the first entrant class.

It doesn't make sense to enact any legislation that would impact upon Proposal No. 48 before the study is completed. For this reason, I think you should vote for No. 27. Again I repeat, that if you are going to conduct the study, you want to know the impact that 48 has over a five-year period, then I don't see why you enact 42 in the first place. I urge your support for Proposition No. 27 today. Thank you.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina AT&T State University): I would rise for the purpose of supporting my colleague, commissioner Frank, who, as you know, is a former chair of this Conven-

tion, in relationship to his call for support on No. 27. The reasons for this support are articulated thus.

No. 1, Proposition 42, as passed a year ago, is characterized by some as morally bankrupt.

No. 2, it has been defined by others as constitutionally questionable.

No. 3, it singles out a specific class of students for special treatment.

No. 4, as so eloquently indicated by President Bok of Harvard: "It fails to answer the basic question of how does 42 help the student. Does it not really penalize the victim?"

No. 5, it does not appear to be an attack on No. 48.

And, finally, No. 6, the original vote on 42 was "no;" and after 12 hours of scurried activity following the departure of presidents, the vote was changed to "yes." I think in light of that history it is important for us to set the record straight and notwithstanding the success announced with regard to No. 26, let's go all the way and say "no" on 42 by supporting a "yes" vote on No. 27. Thank you.

Bill L. Atchley (University of the Pacific): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak to the defeat of No. 27. I know there have been many discussions about SAT, primarily, being discriminatory and so on. However, I am not going to say that everybody is intelligent, that they are ready to approve that 700 on the SAT score, and you are really putting 400 on both sides of that. You are only asking someone to pass 25 percent. I would ask maybe those people who are coaches and athletics directors that if they graded their athletes that they recruited and if they only made 25 percent, would they give them the opportunity for a scholarship.

I think that we have taken a step forward. The Presidents Commission has taken a step forward and corrected the unfairness essentially for need purposes in 26. I think this is in the best interest of the academics for all the students, and I do not think it is unfair. It is unfortunate that we had to get in such debate over SAT scores. We say the SAT scores are not valid here; how do we continue to give scholarships with other additions to other students based on SAT? It may not be the best, but it is the best today. I strongly say let's defeat Nos. 27 and 28 and uphold No. 26.

L. Douglas Johnson (University of Miami (Florida)): I speak in support of Proposition No. 27. Proposition 48, Bylaw 14.3, was successful in establishing guidelines for institutions to improve academic standards and thereby improve on the quality of the student bodies. Proposition 42 has been shown to be punitive; and as pointed out by earlier speakers, there is a study on No. 48 at this time, which will be concluded in 1991. If at the conclusion of this study, it is proven that further modification is needed, at least the modification will be done in the light of the study and not as a reaction or feeling to current academic standards.

If we are going to continue to go down the road for academic performance, it seems it would be better to go down with the data pro-

vided by that study than to be wandering through the dark and creating legislation, which may in one or two years need to be modified again.

Delegate: I applaud the Presidents Commission on its intent to be sensitive, and I hope everyone will be able to relate to Proposition 42. In fact, most of it has been successfully passed in 26. I suspect that the person who wrote this looked at Nos. 27 and 28, thus thinking that 26 is a compromise. We are now an hour and some odd minutes into our first meeting.

Last year, I stood before you and I talked about several things. One thing I was convinced of was my apparent confusion as to what Proposition 42 was. Now, I am that certain people don't know what 42 is. Let's put it to bed, vote 27 in and start it. Please think of voting positive for Proposition No. 27 and eliminate No. 42. Start from scratch, but let's do it properly, intelligently and for the good of all our student-athletes in our universities.

John T. Casteen III (University of Connecticut): I am speaking with regard to No. 27, because I am the immediate past chair of the College Entrance Examination Board and because previously I was chair of the council on infraservices of that board, which among other things oversees the administration of the SAT and the development of items in it, the interpretation of its validity. Also, I was the author of the standards of practice things that governed the use of standardized course scores published by the College Board. I have three concerns on the matter before us in Nos. 26, 27 and 28. The first is this: We took action on Proposition 48 that logically requires at least one academic generation to be validated. It is customary practice to make fundamental changes in the operation of academic institutions to go through enough operating cycles to gauge the validity of what we have done. The actions involved in No. 26 today and No. 42 last year violate a fundamental principle by which we govern academic institutions. That is that we test empirically the actions that we take.

Second, I am concerned about the fundamental issue of the validity of the test scores as they are used by the NCAA. Both the College Board and the ACT, along with all other respectable psychometrical organizations, categorically prohibit the use of test scores, which is to say absolute scores to determine whether students are in or out of a given program. The reasons are several, but a basic reason is that the use of any score to predict academic performance is subject to test of validity. It is a fundamental matter of the practice of colleges and universities that we validate our admissions criteria on a regular basis, and the common mechanisms are the multiple-indicator-regress analyses that are done by all your admissions or research people on a periodic basis to validate the criteria used in selection.

The tough scores as built in No. 48 and No. 42 have never been validated, but they are a proper procedure by the NCAA. To say the tests are biased or unbiased, or that they are racist or unracist, is

beside the point. Fundamentally, they are basic methods used in all reputable colleges in the country to carry out the validation. This use has not been subjected to that kind of validation. That is fundamentally improper.

Let me observe that there are differences in institutions that make it highly improbable that any test score will ever be valid for this purpose. If you have students selected on a very narrow range, let's say you have a college where virtually all test scores fall between 1,200 and 1,300, you would never find a high correlation between academic indicators in the port of entry into college and student rates. If, on the other hand, you have a wide distribution, if your scores range from 400 to, let's say 1,400, you will find a relatively high degree of correlation simply because your population is more vastly diverse. Fundamental facts, such as that, call in question the basic integrity of the decision made in No. 48, which in principle I support.

I would finally observe that the College Board, ETS and the NCAA have reached agreement in recent months about the need to develop a better methodology using multiple criteria, grades, test scores, perhaps class ranking and perhaps other things. Is it only logical to have a better methodology consistent with the best practice of the place before making fundamental decisions of this kind?

I favor No. 27 because of the fact I think the issues are being voted out of logical sequence. No. 27 should have been voted first and then 28, and then 26. Thank you very much.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I rise in support of No. 27. I think that it is important to echo what Chancellor Fort had to say. We are doing within Nos. 26 and 42 something that is purely punitive. There is a naive assumption, and it amazes me among educators, that we would assume the problem with youngsters is motivation. We are dealing with structural deficiencies in our educational system. Motivation is only one element among many that we are talking about.

It is important also to realize and recognize that financially need-based aid because of differences in institutions, differences in conferences is going to result in a much more uneven playing field. It will result in many institutions, for those who need the economic aid the most, are getting less than what they would get under the athletics scholarship limitations.

I need not be cynical to point out that this Proposition 26, as it was passed, would offer the opportunity even within the letter of the law to play games with it. The spirit of the regulation would be tampered with. If we don't want partial qualifiers, let's address that issue. Let's not go through this charade of trying to get institutional need-based aid as a stop to our finances.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I speak against Proposal No. 27. When we passed Proposition 48, we sent out a message, a strong message to young people, educators on the high-school level, and any others involved that they were going to

have to do a better job in the education of these young people, particularly prospective student-athletes. Proposition No. 42 has become a strong statement.

There are so many of these young people who look to Michael Jordan as another exploiting voice. Others are motivating forces. We have to make sure that they understand that in order to be able to emulate actors, instead of heroes, they are going to have to start at an early age and do it academically. I think No. 42 has done it. I think Proposition 26 addresses some of the problems that we have. You know, I have been in the field for 40 years, and I may not have the educational background to understand some of the nuances that are being presented here as far as whether they are fair or unfair to the kids. But I know what is happening to Proposition 48 if No. 27, is passed.

College sports has had a grade-point average that the kids are being better prepared to compete in Division I. I think that 42 has had the same kind of impact. My experience in dealing with Blacks, and I think basically this is the problem: to be fair with Blacks, my experience with Blacks in sports and entertainment is that they have proven, when given an opportunity, that they can compete and be better. They have competed in the world where they have to be better than whites—not as good as whites but better than whites—in order to be successful. Any time they have been given an opportunity, they have done it. Any time they have had a challenge, they have responded to it.

Hopefully, we will not now say that you cannot respond to the challenge, that we don't have enough confidence in you and you cannot respond to that challenge. I think that we owe it to them to give them an opportunity to say, "Okay. You have given us a challenge and in an area where it is doubtful whether we can compete, but give us a chance." Let's give them the chance. That is what I think we are doing when we modify No. 42 with Proposition 26. We should eliminate No. 27. All we will have done is send out another confusing message to the youngster who bounced the ball through the streets of Brooklyn and everywhere else. We have confused them again. We may sit in this hall and talk about a lot of things, but the message that will get out, is you don't really have to study for this. If you do good enough and you run fast enough, if you can throw it and you can jump, you are going to get it. You are going to get a couple of years in there and you can be a pro athlete.

My God, I think that is where a lot of our problems are. I think if we backtrack now and we rescind No. 42, if we pass No. 27, we take them one great big step backwards.

Eddie Milton Jones (Grambling State University): Since it is infinitesimal clear that I am ebony imbued, since I have worked with students who represent the keys on a piano, being black and white, and since I have been black for 44 years, I think that I can say without fear of contradiction that students who are allowed to enter through the back door; who don't have to worry about the

financial problems of work, study or perhaps wages, and whose primary concentration then at that point is to deal with the academia, do better. Many of us, whether we elect to admit to it or not, have been allowed to make strides, progress by having come through some kind of back door. So, if the elimination of No. 42 is to be considered a back door, so be it, as long as the student is given the opportunity to at least walk through the hallowed doors and see what it means to get an education.

If more colleges, if more universities, would start doing more with their developmental and educational programs, if they would dedicate themselves more to the whole idea of the student and making sure that that student does get an education, then it would be better. But, no, the student is sacrificed in the first year, and then for the remaining three years that he is used or she is used, and this is grossly wrong. An education is the birthright of each and every individual, and to deny a student that right is wrong.

I think that we need to reexamine why we are here or why institutions exist. Students are the bottom line at any and every institution. The reason is God's crowning gift to man. I am very scared that a lot of us are exhibiting this whole idea of not reasoning at all. Thank you.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Proposition No. 27. Our fundamental problem, in my mind, in terms of academic standards is the fact that because of the way they are structured and because of the kinds of programs they provide and know they support the faculty, we have institutions that are admitting students without giving them the proper support in order for them to be successful.

I would say to those institutions that it is morally wrong to admit any student to your institution who does not have any chance of being successful at that institution. I do not believe that Proposition 42, the 1989 Proposition 42, has anything at all to do with academic standards, because we have not validated the fact that it is a legitimate academic standard. I don't believe that Proposition 42 has anything to do with higher expectations for students of minorities or those with low-income backgrounds. If we were concerned about academic standards at that point, then it seems to me that we would do something about the academic-core requirements; because we know that when you look at studies of the SAT, the greater predictors of success on the SAT relate to income and the courses that the students take in high school, whether they study sufficient math and science courses, and English courses.

Yet, we have not done anything about the core curriculum. At the same time we want to do something about the SAT. I believe that the 1989 Proposition 42 is based solely on accepting the proposition that the SAT score is a true predictor of success at all schools within the NCAA. We had very eloquent discussion from my colleague from the University of Connecticut, and all the experts in testing say that this is an improper use of standardized test scores

and that the least we can do is to validate that measure before we use it. Yet we ignore all of the experts.

I have two questions for the Convention. One is, is it too much to ask that we at least validate our admissions standards prior to implementation? Secondly, is it too much to ask that we insure fairness and integrity in our procedures? I urge you to support Proposition No. 27.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I have been reading very carefully the language with regard to Propositions 26 and 27. I think it is very clear that while we voted as a body to overrule the decision of the chair, the chair was right in a very technical way. Whether or not we wanted to have the opportunity, which I agree with, to have this body express its opinion on whatever issue it wants to, in a very real and very technical way No. 26 did indeed moot 27. No. 26 rescinds Proposition 42. It puts new language in its place. What would be done by 27 would be to repeal 42, but 42 has already been repealed. It would not affect the language that has been included by Proposition 26. I believe that is the case and I would like to hear a ruling from the chair or the parliamentarian or the staff in that regard.

I believe that if we do now indeed pass 27, we find ourselves in one very substantial mess. We have both the language, which has been included by the passage of 26, and the language that would be reinstituted that was excluded by the passage of Proposition 42; and the two are not at all consistent.

Mr. Skelton: Now, I have three friends. (Laughter) I think that is a dilemma that I am not sure how will resolved if No. 27 is, in fact, passed.

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I agree with Chancellor Young that what we in effect have done with No. 26, as amended, is rollback the original 42, with one exception. Those of you who have not dealt with Proposition 48 students, we now have the ability to not count them in our count until their second year when they participate. So, in effect, the message of confusion that Joe Paterno refers to is compounded even more. We can bring this typically underprivileged student in because most of us realize that Proposition-48 students typically are those students in the most need, fund them and not count them in our count for head count. So, it only points to the reason why No. 27 needs to be passed to get back to our study of 48. I would urge passage of No. 27.

Gary R. Roberts (Tulane University): The one thing that bothers me about the whole focus of this debate is that the people who would like to rescind Proposition 42 paint the picture that those who support Proposition 42 are in favor of a system that penalizes and excludes students; whereas, they don't exclude anybody. That is just nonsense. The reality is that there is a fixed number of athletics scholarships that are going to go to kids in this country. The issue is not whether we exclude kids, the issue is which kids we exclude.

Do we exclude the kid who is the great ball player with the 600 SAT, who comes in and is 80 percent of the time exploited and doesn't graduate, or do we give that scholarship to the kid who is not quite as good a ball player and who has a 900 or 1000 SAT? We are going to exclude kids. There are thousands of kids out there who would like the opportunity to go to college but can't because they can't afford it. But we are excluding them today and we will continue to exclude them even if we repeal Proposition 42.

But if we mean what we say, that our system is to provide educational opportunity to those kids who can take advantage of it, I would rather give the scholarship to the black student with the 900 SAT who scores 10 points a game instead of to the student who has a 600 SAT who scores 30 points a game. If we are using SAT as a cut-off, here you are using points for a game as a cut-off. It seems to me that is hypocritical and that is exactly what we are trying to do away with when we passed No. 42 in the first place.

Paul Hardin (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I rise to oppose No. 27. The experience of my university a year ago is a microcosm of how difficult this question is. I respect the argument on both sides. We originally opposed Proposition 42 when the Presidents Committee suggested we needed further study. On reconsideration, we turned around and supported it because we wanted to be identified with the enhancement of academic standards for athletes. We have been painfully aware of the dangers of discrimination. For a solid year, the committee has been working and we have worked this morning an hour and 45 minutes, and we are still working today to make Proposition 42 fulfill its original intent without discriminatory aspects.

I think we have done a pretty good job. We have worked to perfect No. 42, and it is better now with No. 26. I support it strongly and I suggest that we go down to 27.

[Proposal No. 27 (Page A-28) was defeated by Division I, 92-228, five abstentions, roll call, after motion to sustain the chair's ruling that adoption of No. 26 would make Nos. 27 and 28 moot was defeated.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at 12:05 p.m.]

Monday Afternoon, January 8, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Mr. Skelton presiding.

Mr. Skelton: Will you, please, take your seat so we can begin the afternoon session. I will attempt to tell you again why I thought No. 28 was moot. I am not sure whether you still disagree or not. To me, No. 26 rescinded No. 42. No. 28 is an attempt to postpone No. 42, which has already been rescinded. I don't think you can delay implementation of something that has already been rescinded.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Pell Grants

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 37 [The motion was seconded.]

Adoption of the proposal would permit a student-athlete in Division I who qualifies for financial assistance under the Pell Grant program to receive the maximum amount of institutional financial assistance if the Pell Grant funds, in combination, do not exceed the value of the full grant-in-aid, plus \$1,700 for the total cost of attendance at his or her institution, whichever is less. Current legislation limits the total amount of the Pell Grant funds the recipient may receive beyond the value of the full athletics grant of \$1,400 in Division I member-institutions. The Council believes this legislation more accurately reflects indirect costs for which a student-athlete may be responsible above the value of the full grant-in-aid.

This proposal retains the current safeguard, however, that the combined institutional financial aid of the Pell Grant fund cannot be more than the total cost of the attendance at his or her institution. The Council requests your support of this matter.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I am comptroller and former director of financial aid at Central Connecticut. Proposition No. 37 is representative of that kind of well-intentioned legislation often considered and adopted by this Association and without complete understanding of its impact on a number of institutions. This proposal is intended to amend the total dollars the student-athlete can receive from the value of a full grant-in-aid plus \$1,400 in Pell Grants to the value of a full grant-in-aid plus \$1,700 in Pell Grant, or the student-athlete's institutional cost of attendance, whichever is less.

"Whichever is less" is the phrase that you really need to understand in this legislation. If we adopt Proposition No. 37, then tomorrow adopt Proposition 41, which provides to include educational supplies in the NCAA class of attendance, the rules will have been significantly changed. Proposition 41's passage, which I support, will effectively wipe out one of three cross categories over and above the NCAA-defined full grants-in-aid that the Pell Grant rules heretofore existed to support.

Since many of you do not, in the course of your duties, work with those Federal regulations governing the awarding of need-based financial aid, let me point out that only two categories will remain for the determination of financial aid to define cost of attendance: miscellaneous personal expenses and transportation. Recently released 1989 data prepared by the College Scholarship Service, indicate average costs for these miscellaneous expenses and transportation for all four-year public institutions to be \$1,484 and for all four-year private institution to be \$1,232. Simple arithmetic tells us that any full-need student-athlete at more than half of our

institutions will not qualify for the \$1,700 Pell Grant supplement and, in fact, are supported adequately by the current \$1,400 provision. It makes no sense to put the cart before the horse.

Today, we debate increasing the cost of attendance ceiling, while tomorrow we may eliminate one of those expense categories beyond the current NCAA maximum for which the additional Pell Grant funds have been legislated to cover.

Another common misunderstanding is that the student-athlete is denied part of his or her full Pell Grant award by this or existing NCAA legislation. This is simply not true. Eligible recipients in all cases receive their full Federal Pell Grant entitlement. We also encounter those occasions that arise repeatedly and may show that our Association is callous. I know everyone in this room shares a common concern for the student-athlete who is basically in a family crisis or personal emergency at home. Proposition 37 is not an automatic \$300 increase for Pell Grant recipients to address such situations. We should not be misled that it is. Today, it is perfectly legitimate on the human side and well within NCAA regulations to provide any full student-athlete with a loan to meet emergency costs of transportation to his or her home or for other personal expense items. This loan is not countable under 15 02.33. These students may also earn funds through the summer or other approved opportunity periods to support these incidental costs or to repay their loans. That is what most other students do.

Proposition No. 37, while well intended, will not meet the expectations that prompted it. We should not deceive ourselves. I urge that we defeat this proposal.

Tom Osborne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I would like to speak in favor of No. 37. I represent the American Football Coaches Association. A poll was sent out to the Division I coaches and 63 responded. There were 63 in favor of No. 37 and none was opposed. Those of us who work every day with athletes realize that we are dealing with 25 to 30 percent of our squad that receive absolutely no funding, no help from their homes; and we find that many of these athletes really exist at poverty level on our campuses. They do not operate at the same level financially as the average student does, and we feel that it is wrong not to allow them the full amount they qualify for. It is true that many would not qualify for \$1,700, but those who do qualify, we believe, are entitled to the full amount. The coaches feel very strongly this is something that needs to take effect.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I want to back up what Tom Osborne just said just to give a clearer picture of what the situation is, because I think the first speaker maybe misled some of you folks as to what happens in a Division I situation if a youngster goes and borrows some money to go home. The implication that he can pay back that loan by working is simply not true. Most of these kids have to go to summer school in order to be able to graduate.

College football, in Division I-A, and I can't speak for the basketball, is very demanding for youngsters. It is not only a long season but a demanding season. He can't work in the off-season while he is in school. He can't supplement his income in any way. So, I think that he can't work when he has to go to summer school and he has to maintain normal progress in order to graduate.

I think we are all here with the attitude and idea that we have to graduate more students than we have been graduating. Also, just so you have a realistic picture of what is going on out there, I have a youngster who gets caught stealing \$11. This happened to me this past year. He got caught stealing \$11. He is in the apartment of a friend that is having a party and there is the \$11 on the bedroom dresser. He picks up the \$11 and is turned in and he is dismissed from school. I call him and I say, "Donnie, why in God's name did you steal 11 bucks?" He said, "I was broke. I didn't have a penny in my pocket." I said, "What happened to your Pell Grant?" You get it all in one lump sum, as I understand."

He said, "Well, my mom had a problem with my kid brother. She called me up and I had to send the money home." You know, I would have liked to have said to that kid, "Why didn't you come to me. I will lend you some money." That is what I would have done if he were a nonathlete. That would be what I would do; I would lend the kid \$100. Now, that is not a fairy tale. That is absolutely what happened. That is, so help me God, a true story.

So any time we as coaches are advocating giving these kids a little bit more, we understand what they have given up. We understand the trials they have, economic problems they have; and sometimes we get a little emotional because we grieve for these kids and can't do a damn thing to help them.

[Proposal no. 37 (Page A-48) was approved by Division I, 243-73, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[NOTE: Proposal No. 28 (Page A-29) was ruled moot by the chair due to the adoption of No. 26 and defeat of No. 27. A motion to sustain the chair's ruling was sustained.]

Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier—Eligibility

Stanford Cazier (Utah State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Big West Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 38—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

We support the intent of Proposal No. 38. We believe a nonqualifier or a partial qualifier who defies the predictors and makes satisfactory progress towards a degree should receive a fourth year of eligibility in that student's fifth academic year.

However, we believe the academic-progress requirement should be a very stringent one that insures the nonqualifier will, in fact, graduate. Proposal No. 38—1 raises the progress requirement to 105 semester credits or 158 quarter credits. This is already an aca-

ademic-progress rule that we are familiar with in our own conference for competition in a fifth academic year. We believe it should apply to this particular proposal.

Proposal No. 38—1 would require an average of about 26 semester credits per year in each of the first four years, and it would make it highly likely that that nonqualifier or partial qualifier competing in a fourth year of eligibility would, in fact, graduate. That is the purpose of these academic requirements. We urge your support of No. 38—1 to make this proposal even more effective.

[Proposal No. 38—1 (Page A-49) was approved by Division I.]

Stanford Cazier (Utah State University): Mr. Chair, Proposal 38 is in line with the original intent and spirit of Proposition 48, which requires the unprepared student-athletes to acclimatize academically during their freshman years prior to exposing them to the additional rigors of practice and competition in the intercollegiate setting. Subsequent amendments to the original Proposition 48 have added punitive measures, which ultimately have taken away some incentives for the student-athlete to achieve at a high level academically and to complete the baccalaureate degree in time or in reasonable time.

Proposal No. 38 provides new incentives for a partial or nonqualifier student-athlete to work in earnest towards a degree by returning a fourth year of competition to the fifth prop year. In order for the student-athlete to qualify for this highly motivating reward and return to the normalcy that their teammates enjoy, a partial or nonqualifier must complete a minimum, and of course the minimums now are according to the amended 105 semester and 158 quarter units, toward a specific baccalaureate-degree program at a certifying institution by the beginning of the fifth year following the initial full-time enrollment.

It is the belief of the Big West Conference that by completing this requirement a student-athlete will have proven clearly that he or she can succeed in the university classroom environment and should no longer be penalized for an academic deficiency with which they entered college four years earlier. In most instances, the student-athletes qualifying for this reward will be easily within one year of obtaining their degree; and this proposal will provide an additional incentive for them to conclude their education.

Importantly, the granting of this provision shall be overseen and administered by the member conferences. I am of the opinion, and I think the conference generally is, this does not send the wrong message to students because there is still a penalty to pay. The student has to achieve now what is required in the amendment by the end of the fourth year. There are very few students, even those who enter without the full qualification, who complete in four years. It is an opportunity for us to remove a stigma that can be associated with a nonqualifier or a partial qualifier.

It takes the partial or nonqualifier to prove they can swim academically and maybe setting academic records along the way, and

some have proven that. I think an example is my son who is now a junior at the University of Chicago Medical School. There were some students, only three in fact, who came in marginally. He was very concerned about that. They were deficient in biochemistry, deficient in biology. Fortunately, that school invested in them. They are now juniors and will complete their degrees; and so should they, even though they were deficient at entrance.

Certainly an incentive is lacking to participate further academically and athletically without this proposal. It is a high incentive to graduate as well. It helps people to move into the mainstream, to market either academically or their athletics talents. I would say that our records as an athletics association has not been overwhelming with regard to encouraging graduation of those athletes that we invite into our environments. This would certainly provide that.

I again think that it is an educational-psychology axiom that high scores are significant and low scores are not; only good students can achieve high scores or grades. But a potentially good student can receive a poor grade in high school and essentially achieve a high grade in college.

Steve D. Milburn (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): It is the role of the Division I members to motivate and support those students who achieve academic success as they progress towards graduation. We feel that allowing students who come from an educational background that do not prepare them well to earn a year of competition back by doing it right and working hard as a college student is an appropriate motivational tool. We believe this sends the right message to students everywhere and rather than continue to punish them for whatever happened in the past, it rewards them for the good things they have been able to achieve at their institution. We urge adoption. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-48) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 38—1.]

Resolution: Freshman Eligibility—Division I Men's Basketball

Victor Bubas (Sun Belt Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution is the result of a survey conducted this summer in which a majority of the athletics directors and commissioners expressed the desire to examine the possibility of freshman ineligibility in basketball. If you vote for this resolution, you are asking the Presidents Commission and the Council to research the subject. Many data are available now at our member institutions as a result of the academic effects of holding out certain student-athletes in their first year for a variety of reasons.

This research needs to be done because the subject of freshman ineligibility is too complex to attempt to sell at this time or, on the other hand, to justify the denying of the implementation of this con-

cept forever. We cannot command, if you will, the Presidents Commission or the Council to sponsor a proposal for freshman ineligibility in 1991. If the data are convincing enough for them to do so, the passing of this resolution would initiate the process.

The research should reveal the academic comparisons between those who played as freshmen and those who did not and were withheld from competition. I would think that we would have the financial resources necessary to conduct the research. Many of our presidents, I am sure, would be extremely interested in the results.

Basketball coaches voted overwhelmingly, about 95 percent, for freshman ineligibility after our last annual Convention. But they realized the necessity for two forms of support if they could get it. First, the conferences realized the need for good research and secondly, the need for the support of the Presidents Commission and the Council if it were ever to become a reality. We have these six presidents who have sponsored No. 56 and we have had many others who are willing to do so.

After the research, we will ask the Commission and Council to form their conclusions and decide if they wish to sponsor a proposal next year on freshman ineligibility in the sports that they want to include. We urge your support of this resolution, which does not call for compulsory action by the Commission or the Council. It is a request for research and deliberation by two groups representing all constituencies. If a proposal is forthcoming in 1991, we can vote on it at that time. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-63) was defeated by Division I, 162-165.]

Two-Year College Transfer—Nonqualifier

Billy M. Seay (Louisiana State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would reduce the potential for abuse of the junior-college transfer rule and would provide a more adequate opportunity for nonqualifiers to develop their academic skills at a junior college. It requires three regular semesters or four regular quarters before a student would be eligible for financial aid, participation or practice. I strongly urge the passage of No. 57.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-64) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition—20-Year-Age Rule

Betsy J. Mosher (Northwestern University): I move approval of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was approved.]

Currently, student-athletes who compete in outside organized competition after their 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution, upon matriculation may compete for that institution until their next birthday. If, in fact, they compete after their birthday, they get charged with another year of eligibility during that academic year. This proposal would change the lan-

guage to be more similar to the five-year block and also charge only one year of competition for that academic year.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-65) was approved by Division I.]

Automatic Qualification For 1991 and 1992 Division I Men's Basketball Championship

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsoring conferences, I would like to withdraw Proposal No. 69-A and move Proposal No. 69-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, Proposal No. 69-A would have provided for a play-in to the Division I Men's Basketball Championship in the event that the number of eligible conferences exceeds the number of conferences that are awarded automatic bids and that play-in was approved by the Executive Committee last month. Although the Executive Committee endorsed, as did the Basketball Committee, the concept that any such game should not count, in the same way that the tournament itself does not count, and as necessary conference play-offs do not count, the Executive Committee did not propose legislation for this Convention, because I guess it had passed the deadline. Proposal 69-B does propose that legislation.

We were informed by the parliamentarian before the Convention that it remained in order and that it will remain in order and in effect regardless of what happens to the exemptions under Proposal 30, which will be considered in the general business session. It does have the support, I believe, of both the Executive Committee and the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, and I hope that it will meet with the membership's approval.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I would like to make a comment. I will support Mr. Orleans' motion with regard to Section B of No. 69. We accept, or most of us if not all of us do, this legislation because of the fact it is the best we could get. I think that the appropriateness of Part B, however, is still overshadowed by the reality that the basketball committee, the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, makes the decision to eliminate on the basis of its year-long deliberations automatic berths.

The Executive Committee, as I indicated earlier this morning in the Divisions I-A and I-AA meetings, made the decision to support that position. As a result, following further discussions and compromises, as indicated by commissioner Orleans, No. 69-A has been rescinded. Now No. 69-B provides an opportunity for those campuses that are involved in the play-offs down to the final 30 to gain admissibility of their number through this playoff process in that they will concurrently receive dollars from the NCAA for participation.

I have just one question and that is this: If B passes, is it conceivable that a resolution could be proposed one year hence that would call for the widening of the slots from 30 to 32? I would just like to get that information as a point of order. There are currently 30

slots. Hypothetically, could we expand next year on the basis of resolution to 32? That is the question.

Mr. Skelton: Part B refers only to the exemptions of contests and would not limit what could be brought before the Convention in future years.

Mr. Fort: On that basis, I will support commission Orleans relative to Section B.

Jeffrey N. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Mr. Chair, I would just like to make one comment in response to that to make clear the intentions of the sponsors and also to make clear what 69-B does. The question of tournament shares is not part of Proposal No. 69 and is not part of No. 69-B. It was decided by the basketball committee and the Executive Committee entirely apart from any other process.

What 69-B will do is allow the conferences that are identified there as being involved in the play-in next year to be able to schedule whatever the full number of regular-season contests is without having to worry about the fact that two champions will need to play in their play-in game. It simply completes the piece of work that the basketball committee and the Executive Committee have done.

[Proposal No. 69—B (Page A-73) was approved by Division I, 302-20, roll call. Part A was withdrawn.]

Sports Sponsorship Criteria

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal should look familiar, because it was before us last year. It was adopted by Divisions II and III a year ago and was not adopted by Division I. There was apparently some confusion over what it means, and I will try to explain this so we can adopt it this year.

It simply says that in individual sports, as opposed to team sports, that when you are counting that sport toward the six or seven that you have to have in Division I that you cannot count more than two contests in any single multiteam competition. In other words, if you are having a golf match with five teams and you are going to calculate your team scoring as in each of the other four—in other words A versus B, A versus C, D versus E—you can count only two of those as contests toward meeting the minimum-contest criterion. This will be true of golf, tennis, wrestling and the so-called individual sports.

Why do we need to do this? Because there are institutions that are in effect attempting to conduct an entire season in one or two meets. That is not the intent of the sports-sponsorship requirements. If you can wrap up a cross country season, for example, in one or two meets by counting each score against another team as a contest, you certainly cannot claim to be conducting a legitimate program in that sport.

In short, to answer last year's question, this has nothing to do with how many times you compete against any given team during your season. It simply says that you can't count more than two contests in one of those multiteam competitions in the individual sports.

In behalf of the Council, I urge a favorable vote.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-76) was approved by Division I.]

Reconsideration of Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier—Eligibility (No. 38)

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): Mr. Chair, having voted on the prevailing side on No. 38, I would like to move for reconsideration on the basis of the desire to put a 2.000 GPA in along with the 105 hours. I would hope the proposers would come back with a new piece of legislation the next time around and pass it.

[The motion was seconded.]

Keith I. Polakoff (California State University, Long Beach): The sponsors of Proposal No. 48 have no objection to the concept of the 2.000 GPA, but we would suggest that a more appropriate procedure would be not to reconsider this year but simply to bring it in as a separate amendment next year. If we reconsider No. 28 this year, there are students who are in the first group to become victims of Prop 48 who will have used up their eligibility this year. Delaying the implementation of No. 38 will mean that group of students never gets the benefit that is intended by the incentives supported by Prop 38. The idea is not a bad one, but we do think the procedure for implementing it is. I would urge that the body vote against reconsideration at this time.

David H. Bennett (Syracuse University): There was very brief debate on Proposition 38. Delegates, I believe it represents a serious move away from the meaning of Proposition 48 as was passed in 1983. As I have said on a number of occasions, one of the purposes behind Proposition 48 is to serve as a message, a clear message to high-school students that if they do not attend to their academic as well as their athletics concerns in secondary schools they will have to pay a price.

Now, we are telling these students once they come to college that the price will not be the one that they have understood all along. Before we act quickly, without serious debate, to move away from one important implication of Proposition 48, I believe that we need a wider range of debate or perhaps some more thoughtful discussion.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I believe we should not reconsider this motion. I support Proposition No. 38 as passed. First of all, this is not a new proposition before this body. We had an identical proposition before us last year. There was substantial debate. We have had a year to think about it; and a lot of people have thought about it and discussed it among themselves, and among their conferences, within the schools, et

cetera.

I am against reconsideration at this point for the reasons stated. I don't believe that we should hold Proposition 48 students to a higher standard than we hold any other student-athlete that proceeds through our normal progress under Proposition 48. That, to me, seems to be a real unfortunate and unfair "double whammy" on them. In principle, I would support a 2.000 grade-point average for all students all the way through. We, at our institution, have that, in fact; and we do enforce it. It is not an NCAA rule, however.

So I see no reason to enforce it on one select group of students that have found themselves to be successful against the odds. At this time, I would like to recommend that you not vote for reconsideration.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chair, it seems to me that this is a far more serious incursion on Proposition 48 than anything else that has ever been proposed. It seems to me this is one area in which we ought to be able to take a look at the operation of Proposition 48 for at least a five-year period before any further action is taken. Therefore, I support reconsideration of this measure.

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): We certainly have no objection to having a 2.000 rule; but it seems to me, as was indicated earlier, that the appropriate way to implement it is to bring forth such an amendment next year. Proposition 38, as it passed, provides an opportunity for the nonqualifier—the partial-qualifier who overcame the predictors who were not very optimistic about that student—and who demonstrated by accomplishing a 105-hour accomplishment over a four-year period that he or she can then compete in Division I athletics. I feel having demonstrated that the predictors are wrong, that the fourth year of eligibility should be provided. I urge you to vote no on reconsideration.

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): Mr. Chair, what would happen if you were to sign a student-athlete in the early signing date and you have a senior who then is declared eligible because he passes this requirement of hours, which, in essence, would give you the potential of 15, 16 or 17 young men or women on scholarships? Then would you not have to go back and honor the scholarships that you gave them before or take away the incentive for the student-athlete to gain the number of hours? It doesn't appear that you can have it both ways.

Mr. Skelton: That is not an issue that the Council, as you know, has discussed. I understand your point. I have no answer for you.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I certainly would concur that Proposition 38 greatly reduces what we did this morning and greatly reduces the effect of Proposition 48, which this Convention so strongly has backed. It opens the door—and if I were an idealist I wouldn't say this—but I am a practical person. As an idealist I think this has some merit; but as a practical person, I understand what it opens the door for.

It opens the door for directed curriculums because we are going to make sure this individual is used for four years and not for three years, and we are going to direct his curriculum from the day he walks on our campus. We are not going to allow him to major in any area other than the one we are sure we can get four years out of, whether he graduates or not. This is a poor piece of legislation. It destroys what this Convention believes in, and I urge you to vote for reconsideration and then defeat it.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I think this Convention has debated No. 38. The Chair has been accused of being arbitrary and capricious. I don't think he was arbitrary and capricious in the debate of No. 38. Let's not bring in the back door what we closed the front door to. Thank you.

Albert E. Bender Jr. (St. Louis University): In regard to what a previous speaker said, if we grant this additional year, we are going to deny an athletic scholarship to some student who probably has prepared himself for college work. The second point is that by the time the student-athlete has had four years of college, one would hope that he would become sufficiently mature to appreciate the need for a degree and not have to be bribed by another year of athletics.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I am speaking neither for or against the reconsideration of Proposition 38. I would just like to tell you why I think it is important to think this thing through. The reason I have been strongly in favor of something like Proposition 42—and again to give you an honest scenario—is that when you talk to a youngster who is not qualified by Proposition 48, you have to realize that he may not make it. His high-school coach says to you, "Suppose he doesn't make it, will you still take him?" Your answer to him is, "You should not even be talking that way to the kid. Everything you can do in that high school ought to be to make sure that that kid does qualify. Give him the incentive to go on and do the work." The coach says, "That is true, but I have five schools that have made a commitment to this kid whether he makes it under 48 or not."

I don't know how that affects No. 38. The problem I see is that we do have some people out there who have the luxury of converting kids who do not measure up to No. 48. That is why we need to have some form of 42. Now, how does No. 38 affect the ability of that other coach to sell that kid? I am not sure how it is going to work.

Michael B. McGee (University of Southern California): It's unintended, but the practical consequences of this will award those institutions who over the last three years have taken more and not fewer Proposition-48 students. It will change the competitive circumstances in that case. We urge reconsideration of Proposition 38.

Jim Walden (Iowa State University): I would just like to state as a person who is fighting the numbers that four years ago this body made a rule in a resolution that we would have a thing called Proposition 48. The rules were explained at that time and it was brought

home to all of us coaches exactly what we had to live by. If a young man was signed, he could not participate one year and then he had three more years to play. Every football coach in America was told exactly those rules. Some of us were told that we would prefer not to have Proposition 48 guys signed. We all said that is great. You will have three years after sitting one.

Now, those of us who have chosen not to take these kids because of the resolution of this body which encouraged us not to. And we are now changing the rules so those people who took them, you are now asking us to allow those guys to come back and play against us one more time even though they were told four years ago that this would not happen. I am morally hoping that we would change the effective date from "immediate" to the future. I have nothing against this proposal but I have something against this proposal "immediately."

So I would like to say I am not against the new generation of Proposition 48 guys getting this break, but I am adamantly opposed to having to play those guys again that were told four years ago they should not do this. Thank you.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 38 (Page A-48) was approved by Division I.]

Stanford Cazier (Utah State University): I think the burden of No. 48 is in a world by itself and it deserves consideration. We are talking about the continuing student. There are plenty of students who, for one reason or another, could not meet entrance requirements. There are plenty of disadvantaged students in this country. I don't think the NCAA record is too impressive with regard to encouragement of completion. We exploit these students and then we abandon them. This is an opportunity to encourage graduation and to lift a stigma from the students who are there.

As I say, again, it is axiom of educational psychology that high scores are significant, low scores are not. Only good students can get high scores or high grades and poor students cannot. But good students, good-potential students, can eventually do that. I have had students in my class who came in disadvantaged and somehow, because of peer environment and the encouragement of professors, they got turned on, they got excited about life and they moved into the mainstream. This is an opportunity to mainstream students academically and athletically. I don't think we ought to have that stigma attached to them. We ought to encourage this.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): Just to back up what Jim Walden said, I feel the same way. I don't feel like this proposal should be retroactive. And I would ask a question, as I read the blue sheet regarding the qualifier and nonqualifier reads: "Agreed that the application of this proposal would be retroactive and that student-athletes who participate in a certified all-star contest, conditioned in their belief that their eligibility has been complete, would not be precluded from receiving an additional season of eligibility."

Does that also include games such as the Senior Bowl where these

people can play? Would they be eligible or not? I again think we are opening up a real can of worms in the sense of that level playing field. I agree with Jim. When this thing passed, I really had no idea it was retroactive. I think that I would be for this if it was not retroactive. I think we should work our way to a more equitable position with non-qualifiers and the fourth year. But it is not fair to make it retroactive in light of the things and decisions that were made four years ago.

Carla H. Hay (Marquette University): I am sure no one in this audience doubts that a lot of nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers will, in fact, academically achieve in college; and that is wonderful. What I don't understand is if they genuinely have learned the error of their academic ways, why do we have to give them a fourth year of eligibility in order to insure that they will stay on and graduate?

Surely after having been in school for four years, they will have figured out for themselves that it is important to get these last few classes, 15, 20 to 25 hours. There are various ways they can finance the conclusion of their education. I don't think they need a fourth year of athletics support in order to achieve that. I think also this audience is very well aware of the fact that life can be very tough on people if you accumulate records. All kinds of students, all kinds of people do. Sometimes we have to live with those records. I have students who come in and want to go to law school. They have blown a year of their college courses. I can tell them, "Well, hopefully, people will look at what you have done subsequently, but you may be penalized because you did that."

I think we want to reinforce the message in the high schools that we need to come out of high school with the kind of record that is not going to put us in the position of being denied academic and sports from our freshman year forward. That is the message we want to send to these students.

Richard J. Dunn (University of Washington): I speak in opposition to this proposition. A number of the speakers have seemed to lay on us the responsibility for providing academic incentives. Very little has been said about us making sure that these people have maintained their eligibility. We have a remarkably good track record in keeping student-athletes eligible, and I think that our research on Proposition 48 will underline that once we have it. But until we have such research and until we know more about the actual circumstances of success and failure with posteligible aids as a whole, it seems to me senseless to presume that we are going to promote academic success by allowing yet more eligibility.

Gary N. Wodder (Scranton University): I have two items. You have already strengthened No. 38 with No. 38—1 and increased the minimum semester credit from 96 to 105, and from 144 to 158. At the time of that passage, I felt there was relief that, in fact, a partial qualifier coming in as a student who needed some assistance would not have a difficult time in getting that.

Now, we are reconsidering No. 38. As we elect to compare the numbers, it seems to me that the student-athletes right now, those who

coach Paterno was talking about, have a right to buy their way in and, in fact, buy a year of eligibility. In fact, this has happened in some institutions.

A student-athlete, who can not buy his way in because he can not afford it but who demonstrates the academic ability to get close to graduation and would like to stay rather than take a professional contract at a lesser term right now, is now getting the opportunity to do that. Obviously, I urge you to vote in favor of this particular amendment that was done not too long ago.

E. M. Jones (Grambling State University): Mr. Chair, I guess I am perplexed again, because we continue to impose upon student-athletes strenuous entrance requirements. But once they get in, there are few incentives for them to do any better. It would appear to me that if they are penalized for not having done as well as they should have in high school and then see the error of their ways in the sophomore, junior and senior years—so much so that they have moved this far toward graduation—then it would appear to me that we would allow them the opportunity to get that fourth year.

If, indeed, we are concerned about the student-athlete getting his or her education, but we don't allow this, then there ought to be inward motivation. As the coach motivates the student on the field, then we as an institution, as coaches, ought to motivate the students in the particular classrooms so that if they do well enough then they will be given that additional year. I think that history will show that we will have more student-athletes graduating and perhaps not going on welfare lines.

Douglas Kahn (University of Michigan): Proposition 48 is essentially a prophylactic measure and very common. There is a number of such measures we are used to, aimed at pressure points to change behavior in the society. In this case, it is largely at the high-school level, both on the high-school student and on the schools. If you say to a high-school student that you don't have to meet this level and still can continue to get your four years of playing in college, if that is motivation, most students will be very optimistic about their ability to do that whether realistic or not.

The purpose of having a hard-and-fast rule is to see to it that at the high-school level the student understands that he has to meet a certain level of performance and do that then and not to be able to accomplish something at a future date. Maybe that is a bad rule. Maybe it was. In fact, we have heard, I don't know whether this is the result of an actual study, that Proposition 48 has been having a significant effect at the high-school level. We now have a study which I understand is about to come out to indicate just how successful that has been.

It seems strange to me at this point just before that study comes to fruition that we would essentially make a major change to Proposition No. 48 without at least seeing what has happened in that study. It would seem to me to be a little premature action at this time.

Billy M. Seay (Louisiana State University): I speak in support of

No. 38. I envy those of my colleagues here who appear to interact with students who are much more mature than the ones I do. It seems to me unlikely that many of our 21- or 22-year-olds will indeed stay an extra year to complete the degree if we don't provide the opportunity for participation. It is also true that No. 38, as amended, is relatively stringent. There will not be many Proposition 48 students who will achieve 105 hours. We are talking about a small number of highly motivated and effective students. I think we should give them an opportunity.

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): Mr. Chair, I speak in favor of 38. Much of this discussion has suggested that Proposition 48 will be reduced in its effect, suggesting that the first year for a non-qualifier or a partial qualifier at a Division I university is a picnic and that they are able to practice and do everything else. They are not. It is a great punishment not to be able to play that first year or to practice that first year. I think that indeed the results of Proposition 48 will not be reduced. The students who have lived through that first year and shown they can compete at an institution and continue to do so through their athletics participation and their academic participation should not be penalized at the other end when they have paid their dues in the beginning.

Tom Osborne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I would just like to reemphasize what Jim Walden and Joe Paterno mentioned. Actually, in recruiting, when Proposition No. 48 went into effect, many schools attempted to look hard at the implication of No. 48 and tried to avoid taking very many Prop-48 players. There were other schools that went out and recruited the same as they always had and in some cases actually indicated to players they didn't need to worry about the test score, it didn't make any difference whether they passed or not. I think some players were interested in that style of recruiting.

To make the thing retroactive now and say that it made no difference sends a very strong message to the students who knew what the rules were when they came in. They understood what the situation was and now to just turn around and say that what we talked about initially didn't count, I don't think is appropriate. I have great sympathy for the athlete and I have great concern about the situation. I have great reservations about some of the things that Proposition 48 did. I don't agree with changing this thing retroactively.

J. Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Clearly, the issue has been clouded into a single issue when there really are two. One is that it has been stressed strongly by many of the speakers that the only way the youngster is going to go to school the next year is if he participates. If you look in the rule book, you will see clearly that you still can award that person a scholarship and it does not count against your limit. I don't want to sound self-righteous, but the schools I am familiar with will continue to award the full scholarship for that young man who came in under the hazard that he had and succeeded in doing what he has accomplished of playing three years and getting close to the degree. I think that the great majority, if not

everyone in this room, will reward him with a scholarship.

Steve D. Milburn (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): As we all know, to be able to participate in a sport, to be an athlete is a very critical element of these young people's identity. It is a big part of how they see themselves as people and so forth. There is not a coach or a former coach in here who doesn't remember telling their kids at some point in time if you do the right things and work hard you will gain an opportunity, that good things will happen. It seems to me that at some point in time telling these kids to work hard and do the right thing will not only result in graduation, but also will result in them getting to do something they love to do, that has been an important part of their lives is a good thing.

The point is that I think that the comment was made earlier that this might lead people to encourage easy curriculums or not to take challenging majors and so forth. Well, if we pass the graduation rates later on, what will happen in that case? Thank you very much.

John O. Bolvin (University of Pittsburgh): I stand in favor of No. 38. I think that this body is losing perspective on one side of this. As much as we have heard this morning, and we have discussed it for three or four years now, the college boards scores, the ACT, are not 100 percent reliable predictors. We all know that of the students we have, a certain percentage succeed and a certain percentage will not succeed. We are talking now about the percentage of students for whom that college board score may not have had any indication of success but who have shown they can succeed. We recommend they be given a fourth year.

Keith I. Polakoff (California State University, Long Beach): I would like to address some of the arguments that have been made against Prop 38, because I am not really clear whether they make any sense.

To begin with, this is not a proposal that sends any kind of message to the high schools at all. It doesn't deal with entrance requirements. It does not deal with the requirements for eligibility in the freshman year. That is a matter that was covered in Prop 48 a few years ago.

We now have the acknowledgement before this body. Last night we heard Dick Schultz also acknowledge that there possibly are flaws in the original language of Prop 48, because of the way in which the board scores were misused. What we are saying today is the argument that even though the language of Prop 48 may not be entirely valid, we are going to stick to the penalties associated with it anyway, even in those cases where the students have succeeded in spite of the invalid use of the award scores.

I don't follow the logic of that. If we get to the point in a year or two where the ACT and the SAT have gotten together with the NCAA staff and perfected the language of Bylaw 14.3 so that the flaws are corrected, we probably at that point wouldn't need something like Prop 38. In the interest of fairness, it seems to me at this point that we really do. The logical thrust of the arguments against 38 seems to be that if you couldn't achieve the necessary standard, including the

board score at the outset, that this becomes a scarlet letter that you must wear for the rest of your lives and nothing that you do in your subsequent behavior is going to remove it.

That just doesn't seem to me to be appropriate. We already know that you can correlate board scores with a lot of factors other than academic preparation. The tendency of scores to vary by gender, for example. We have had a number of references to race. Let's point out the other problem that relates to gender. There is a lot of data out there that show men do better than women on the college boards. But women do better than men in school. They graduate with a higher rate of success. Until those kinds of problems are corrected, it seems to me we need to incorporate into the legislation of this body an opportunity for students to get back what they were penalized for in the first place, particularly in those cases where the penalty was a direct result of the use by this body of standardized test scores that are not always valid.

James H. Zumberge (University of Southern California): I rise to speak against No. 38. There are a number of arguments that have been made that I agree with and I will not repeat those, but there is one that I would like to reinforce. It is an argument already made by three well-known coaches, coach Walden, coach Paterno and coach Osborne. They worked diligently when 48 came on line to help give the message to the high schools. That was the underlying reason why 48 went forward, to better prepare young men and women coming to a university so they wouldn't have the problems in academics they had been having prior to that.

Now, if we pass this and make it retroactive, we lose our credibility with a lot of our coaches who work with us—college presidents, athletics directors and others—to get 48 on board and make it a clear message that universities are no longer going to be the place where you can come ill-prepared or unprepared with only one idea in mind, getting your four years of eligibility and not worrying about a degree. I say to maintain our credibility with our coaches, who have worked hard and have worked in good faith to make 48 work, we ought to vote against 38.

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): Mr. Chairman, I speak against this proposition. Let's be honest about what we are doing here—nullifying the effect of Proposition 48 precisely at the point where it matters the most. The arguments, pro and con, are going to boil down to the effect that coaches are going to be able to tell high-school recruits that they will be getting four years of eligibility whether or not they meet the standards of Proposition 48. That is a disastrous message for us to be sending to the high schools of America at the present time. We ought to call things by their proper name. This is an athletics proposal, and it will be four years of eligibility, nullifying the effect of 48. That is not the position that this body can take at this Convention.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-48) was defeated by Division I as amended by No. 38—1, 125-199, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Division I first approved the proposal. A motion to reconsider was approved, as well as a motion for a roll-call vote.]
[The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

Division I Softball

Diane Milutinovich (California State University, Fresno): On behalf of the NCAA Softball Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to limit the application of the 26-week playing season in Division I women's softball to the academic year. The passing of this proposal would make the playing and practice-season limitation in Division I softball consistent with that of Division I baseball. Since the sports are similar in nature, we feel this would give the women student-athletes the same advantages as their male counterparts. This proposal also is supported by the national governing body of softball, the Amateur Softball Association. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-95) was approved by Division I.]

Football Recruiting Contacts—Divisions I-A and I-AA

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the 1989 NCAA Convention, Divisions I and II adopted Proposal No. 143 to establish one limitation on the maximum number of recruiting contacts for all Division I sports. While the purpose of the 1989 Convention proposal in 143 was laudable—to combine the different contact rules of the various sports and individuals—it has not had the desired affect of simplifying recruiting in Divisions I-A and I-AA football.

Divisions I-A and I-AA are concerned about the conference-contact rule as amended by the 1989 Proposal No. 143, the current violations of the bump rule in college football recruiting. The purpose of 1990 Convention Proposal No. 106 is to reinstate the previous contact rule for Division I-A and I-AA football recruiting. That regulation set forth in Proposal No. 106 would permit once-a-week visits to the prospect's high school during the recruiting contact period.

Each Divisions I-A and I-AA member-institution would be in a position to contact prospects in the sport of football on the same basis without regard to the bump rule since each institution could visit the prospect's high school only once a week during the permissible contact period. We believe this regulation is more effective from an enforcement standpoint and actually decreases the recruiting expenses since the member institution's coaching staff may not be present in the high school other than on one occasion during each week of the appropriate contact period. Accordingly, the NCAA Council and the Association's Recruiting Committee urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-103) was approved by Division I-A and defeated by Division I-AA, 44-47].

Contact and Evaluation Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Britton B. Banowsky (Southland Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

The passage of this proposal would make the months of September and October permissible evaluation days. Further, it would reduce the evaluation period of the month of May to a period between May 1st and May 22nd. The effect of this proposal, it is to be noted, does not result in an expansion of the total number of evaluation days involved.

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): Our coaches oppose this. They prefer to be on campus with their own teams on those Fridays in October.

Tom Osborne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): The reason that the coaches are in favor of this, at least in my region, I believe, is that so many play-offs begin about November 1. As a result, about three-fourths of the high schools are eliminated from competition prior to November 1, which means that you are not able to go out and see them play personally. Most of our coaches are willing to give up some evaluation time in May, which I believe will be a total cost savings, in order to go out four nights locally in October and see some games.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I hate to disagree with my good friend Tom Osborne, but I think we would make a big mistake if we started sending out people on Fridays in September and October. I understand the point about the all-star games. But I believe we have had the problem of coaches traveling on the road until in the middle of the night, coming back in the middle of the morning, and then having to do a good job the day of the game.

I, for one, feel we have an obligation to the people on our squad to do the best we can and to be as fresh as we can. And I don't particularly like the idea of sending coaches out on the road on Friday afternoon after practice. I hope we vote against this.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-103) was defeated by Division I.]

Women's Basketball Evaluations

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal concerns limitations on evaluations in the sport of women's basketball. Currently, individuals permitted to recruit off-campus in the sport of women's basketball for a member institution are permitted to visit a prospective student-athlete's educational institution an unlimited number of times during the evaluation period. This proposal, if adopted, would limit the Division I member institutions' women's basketball staff members to not more than one visit per week to the prospect's educational institu-

tion during an evaluation period regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled at the institution. This also is supported by the Women's Basketball Coaches Association.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-103) was approved by Division I.]

Evaluation Periods—Division I Women's Basketball

Kathy Noble (University of Montana): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 110 on behalf of the Big Sky Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is an attempt to establish an evaluation period in the state of Montana that actually corresponds with the high-school girls basketball games played. In 1989, the evaluation period for Montana high-school girls was November 20th through December 10th and the AA tournament concluded on the 18th of November, two days prior to the start of the evaluation period. The state B and C tournaments concluded on December 2nd, leaving an eight-day period when no girls were playing basketball in Montana at all. We have found it difficult to evaluate players if our coaches are not able to watch them play.

Proposal No. 110 does not lengthen the evaluation period. It will remain at 21 days. These simply will occur in basketball when it is actually played and will not include Thanksgiving week when no basketball is played. Evaluation is the only way to insure fairness of opportunity for female high-school basketball players in Montana. I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 110.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-110) was approved by Division I.]

Recruiting Contacts—Post-High School

C. J. Slanicka (Ohio State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Recruiting Committee has developed this proposal and it is sponsored by the NCAA Council. The purpose of the proposal is to clarify the manner in which the contact limitations will apply to prospects who do not immediately enroll in member institutions. Under these circumstances, there are two sets of contact opportunities; and this amendment is designed to clarify when each set of contact opportunities is applicable. Specifically, Proposal No. 114 would stipulate that the contact limitations set in Bylaw 13.1.4 apply separately to the period in which a prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning with the October 15th following the prospect's completion of high school.

This proposal helps to clarify the application of the contact rule, and we urge your support.

[Proposal No. 114 (Page A-108) was approved by Division I.]

Campus Athletics Events—Special Seating

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 118—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

All this does is change the effective date. Instead of immediately, it will be August 1, 1990, so that this would include the entire recruiting year for all prospects.

[Proposal No. 118—1 (Page A-111) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Windegger: In Proposal No. 118, as amended, the NCAA Council and the Division I Steering Committee have reviewed concerns regarding special seating arrangements for prospective student-athletes attending campus athletics events. These special arrangements often are made at considerable expense to the institution, and they also can lead to rules violations because of isolation of the prospective student-athletes.

In order to resolve these concerns, this proposal is intended to specify that prospective student-athletes visiting Division I member institutions shall not be provided special seating, such as seating in press boxes, special seating boxes or bench areas in any campus athletics events. Instead, visiting prospects should be provided the same type of seating arrangements normally made for the student body in general. We believe this proposal is necessary in order to insure that the system of the recruiting regulations avoid special arrangements designed to create recruiting problems. Accordingly, we urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-111) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 118—1.]

Reconsideration of Two-Year College Transfer— Nonqualifier (No. 56)

Margaret Gatz (University of Southern California): Mr. Chair, having voted on the prevailing side, I would like to move reconsideration of Proposition No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

I have a strong position opposed to freshman ineligibility. However, as an academic has pointed out, it is difficult to oppose a study. Therefore, I am urging reconsideration.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 56 (Page A-63) was defeated.]

Sports Camps and Clinics—Definition

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move the adoption of amendment-to-amendment No. 128—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this amendment, as also applied to some other amendments regarding this legislation in other areas, is to clarify the definition of a camp and clinic in the legislation. Our conference

supports the original amendment with the understanding that the legislation will apply to those camps or clinics involving prospective student-athletes but not to those clinics that have served as valuable educational and professional development opportunities for high schools, junior colleges and other coaches.

We urge your support to this amendment that distinguishes the differences between clinics and camps for prospective student-athletes from those coaches clinics used exclusively for professional development. Staff interpretation presently does not make this distinction.

[Proposal No. 128—1 (Page A-117) was approved by Division I.]

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): For the last two years, the NCAA Recruiting Committee has proposed changes for Bylaw 13.12.1 to support camps and clinic legislation. Many of these proposals have been adopted; and as a result, a greater understanding of this legislation has occurred. The next five proposals are amendments to Bylaw 13.12, which will simplify the application of sports clinic legislation at the Division I level. Currently, the two definitions exist for an institution's sport camp or clinic: one Division I definition and one definition for Divisions II and III. If adopted, Proposal No. 128 would provide one definition for all three divisions. The NCAA Recruiting Committee has consulted coaching associations and other constituent groups and believes that this proposal will simplify some of the confusion that has existed in this area. The NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-117) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 128—1.]

Sports Camps and Clinics

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 130-A and 130-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of Proposal No. 130-A will delete in the Division I language those words identifying the purpose of a sports camp or clinic. The deletion of this language will pave the way for adoption that we propose in 130-B. The adoption of Proposal No. 130-B will make consistent for all membership divisions the words identifying the purpose of an institution's sports camp or clinic. On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee, I urge your support of these proposals.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-119) was approved by Division I.]

Sports Camps and Clinics—Recruiting or Scouting Services

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

Specifically, Proposal No. 125 will make legislation consistent throughout all three divisions, prohibiting a Division I athletics sports staff member from being employed by or lecturing at a camp or clinic that is established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning respective student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-115) was approved by Division I.]

Sports Camps and Clinics—Coaching Staff Employment

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move the adoption of amendment to the amendment No. 126—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

If the membership will support me on this, I will not repeat my previous comments.

[Proposal No. 126—1 (Page A-118) was approved by Division I.]

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): The adoption of Proposal No. 126 would prohibit in Division I football or men's basketball the coaching staffs from being employed by or lecturing at a noninstitutional football or basketball camp. The adoption of this proposal would put an end to the selection of hiring the same institution's staff members in the sports of Division I football and men's basketball by privately owned noninstitutional football and basketball camps. The NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee urge your support.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-116) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 126—1.]

Sports Camps and Clinics—Admissions and Employment

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would provide consistency throughout all three divisions with regard to the employing or giving of free or reduced admissions privileges to a member institution's sports camp or clinic for any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade. Currently, the rule restricts only those individuals who have received athletics awards after secondary school. The NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee urge your support.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): A point of clarification on No. 127: If an institution runs a camp in which the coach works, is it permissible to give free participation in that camp to the son of the coach who is in high school and the son of the athletics director who is in high school?

Mr. Skelton: The response is that there has been no official ruling in that regard, but we think that would be appropriate.

Robert Frank (Oregon State University): I know we are on a roll here, but I would urge the members to consider their vote on 127. To put it bluntly, I think that this is a bit of over-reaching to say that we are going to deny free- or reduced-admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade. In my estimation, that is a bit much. I do think that it is appropriate in instances where individuals who are in high school, who will never be prospective or student-athletes, to be considered for some free admission to some clinics.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I have two concerns about this proposal. One is kind of a technical concern, and it is that many of us have faculty-staff programs that provide free or reduced tuition at institutional camps for children of faculty, as a piece of compensation that applies throughout the university. As far as I can tell, we would no longer be able to offer this benefit to the children of our faculty staff.

Secondly, Dick Schultz mentioned yesterday a program that is being developed in connection with President Bush that would ask NCAA student-athletes in the summer to go out and work with young people, particularly needy young people, in athletics. It seems to me that what we are now saying is that an institution that wants to provide scholarship assistance, as was just pointed out even nonathletes in a local community, in the summer to go to institutional camps would be unable to do so. I certainly understand the sense in which this proposal tries to restrict the potential recruiting abuses, but I would also agree it seems to be a little over-reaching for the purposes to intrude on some other very legitimate institutional and athletic purposes. I would oppose this proposal.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): I believe it is over-reaching. I know that the mayor of Boston has asked us to take in some underprivileged children in all of our camps. We take in some, but we don't take in people that have won their letters in high school. I know that we allow employees' children, of the athletics department and other parts of the university, free admission. I think that the present rule is satisfactory, and I think this rule goes a little too far. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 127 (Page A-116) was defeated by Division I.]

Sports Camps and Clinics—Permissible Time Period

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of amendment to the amendment No. 129—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, there is a variety of academic calendars represented here. Stanford University, for example, operates on a quarter system. We do not begin our fall quarter until almost the first of October. We think it would be appropriate to replace summer vacation periods with a common time of June, July and August for this particular legislation, and we urge adoption of this amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 129—1 (Page A-118) was approved by Division I.]

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): Adoption of Proposal No. 129, as amended, will limit the conduct of the Division I member institutions' football or basketball camps or clinics to the summer months, with the exception of development of clinics as defined by Bylaw 13.12.1.2.2. This limitation would help to insure that member institutions' coaches are not pressured to conduct camps or clinics during the academic year to keep up with other institutions. Both the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee urge your support.

[Proposal No. 129 (Page A-117) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 129—1.]

Official Visits—ACT or SAT Scores

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal, as proposed by its original presenters, who for whatever reason felt they didn't want to present it, is significant and worthwhile for this Convention to consider. It requires a test score prior to an official visit. It does not require a satisfactory test score, it simply requires a test score. This does two things. First, it helps the individual institution evaluate the prospective student-athlete; and secondly, it encourages the student-athlete at an early date to take the ACT, SAT tests, which will be to their benefit to take it more than once if they need to. This is a good proposal and I urge its approval.

William D. Gurowitz (Cornell University): I want to speak in opposition to No. 119. We currently have many students coming to our campus before they know or before sometimes even they take the SAT or ACT. What we have here is a broad rule for a narrow problem that would force all prospective basketball players to take their exams early when they are not as well prepared and often would rather not take it. Often, institutions to which they are applying may not want them to take it early. President Hearn very articulately yesterday warned us about allowing athletics issues to parade in academic regalia and asked us to stop doing so. No. 119 is the core academic decision because of the athletics need. I recommend you vote "no".

E. M. Jones (Grambling State University): Whereas, I realize the necessity for taking the tests as early as possible, as is evidenced because I have seven children and all of mine have started

taking their tests as of the seventh grade, I still feel that a number of students have not had the necessary course work in order to be able to pass the test successfully. Then, there is a monetary problem. So I would vote against this.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-112) was defeated by Division I. Proposal first was not moved.]

Contact and Evaluation Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, after the record of that one, I am not sure I should do this, but I still think it is good that we vote on it so we know where we stand. I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 107 addresses the issue of fall evaluation; but most importantly, it addresses the issue of the lengthy one-month period in the spring. We are now financing an overwhelming number of spring vacations by coaches in Florida and California. Time and time again, this is a costly procedure for most of us, and we can provide a very valuable evaluation period during October and not do that. I move that we adopt Proposal No. 107.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-102) was approved by Division I-A, 61-45, and defeated by Division I-AA.]

WAIVERS

[NOTE: The Division I business session heard a petition for waiver of Division I membership criteria from College of St. Rose. The waiver was denied.]

SPECIAL REPORT

Special Committee on Cost Reduction

Marvin G. Carmichael (Clemson University): The handouts, which are being circulated, were designed to be overheads, so please bear with me as we walk through the analysis. A Special Committee on Cost Reduction was established with the specific charge of identifying means for reducing costs in intercollegiate athletics. During this report, we will attempt to review packages that relate to a need-based grant-in-aid program; provide a brief explanation of the financial need, and as Gene Corrigan reported yesterday, the committee's attitude toward need-based aid.

The committee reviewed several options, and it is important to note that one was to look at applying totally the need-base concept. Second, athletics grants-in-aid covering tuition and fees with additional aid based on need. Third, athletics grants covering tuition and fees, with the additional funds awarded on the basis of need, and a separate specific number of grants that would be awarded in each sports. Fourth, athletics grants covering tuition and fees, room, board, course-related books, and additional funds up to the cost of attendance on the finding of need. Fifth, status quo with reduction in numbers.

In considering a need-based aid program, you have to understand the principles behind student financial need. If you will look at

your first handout, Page 1, financial need is defined by establishing a cost of attendance and subtracting the family contribution, and coming up with financial aid, it is plain and simple. You take what you have and apply to the cost and what you have left, which is what it takes to pay the cost.

You also obviously have to define cost. Let's look at the second page of your handout. You can see the difference between what the financial aid office uses as the cost of attendance and commonly accepted educational expenses used for athletics grants-in-aid currently. You will note the primary difference is supplies, transportation and personal expenses. In defining the financial need, we take into account supplies, transportation and personal expenses.

Family contribution is obviously a key ingredient to this process. Standards must be clearly defined to calculate the ability of the family to contribute to the student's cost of attendance. Both the parents and the students, when the child is dependent on the parent, have to participate in this process. The process of the defining need should be consistent with the same standards used in defining eligibility for a need-based unit financial aid program in general.

Federal methodology is what is used for most Federal and institutional student-aid programs. College Scholarship Services and the American College Testing Services provide a need assessment at this point in time at a charge. I would like to walk through some examples of need calculations so that you will have a better understanding of how those whole process works.

The next page of the handout defines students' cost of attendance. We have three scenarios, Student A, Student B and Student C. We have defined their cost of attendance at \$6,000. We are calling these students comparable in nature so their costs should be identical. We hypothetically are picking three different family contributions just to give you some indication how the process works. Family contribution for Student A is \$700, which has been represented typically as the accepted figure for a needy student. For Student B, it is \$1,500, which is the middle of the road, and Student C has a \$4,000 family contribution, which would be less need obviously.

The way you calculate need is simple. You subtract family contributions from cost of attendance, and you have financial need. The Student A's financial need is \$5,300. Student B's financial need is \$4,500, and Student C's financial need is \$2,000. It is important to make note of those figures. Let's take a look at what a full grant-in-aid is in comparison to that. Just for simplicity sake, we have applied a \$300 value for supplies, just to make it understandable when these figures came out of the air. They are close, but not actual. You can certainly come up with your assessment.

In this case, the Pell Grant has not been taken into account yet and the full grant-in-aid would be considered to be \$4,200. A full grant-in-aid is \$4,200. You can compare that to the financial need, obviously, and see what the difference is.

Let's look at what the Pell Grant does in this whole process. The Pell Grant, the maximum that a student can get, is \$1,400 above the full grant-in-aid that the student is eligible for. If it is more than \$1,400, he is only eligible for the \$1,400 Pell Grant. We add \$1,400 to Student A and Student B, because the Pell Grant we have estimated at \$2,300 for Student A and \$1,400 for Student B. Student C is zero Pell Grant in our estimate.

You can see that the maximum amount of assistance the students can get in this scenario would be \$5,600 for Student A, \$5,600 for Student B, because he is getting the maximum Pell as well. Student C, which would not have the eligibility for the Pell Grant, would only get \$4,200. So what is the difference if you apply the need-based aid program rather than the current situation? The Student A would get \$300 less. Student B would get \$1,100 and Student C would get \$2,200 less.

It is possible for the needy student and/or orphan to receive more money on a need-based program depending on what the institution uses to define cost-of-attendance amounts, supplies, transportation and personal expenses, and any adjustments to family income, family contributions.

At most schools, student-athletes will receive less money under a need-based system, because so many more students will be receiving less money under a need-based financial system. Most institutions would realize the cost savings, the whole fundamental purpose behind our committee. This amount of savings would vary from institution to institution depending on the current level of financial aid commitment and the type of student-athlete being recruited. Any resulting cost savings would be affected and offset by other significant problems. These are very important to note. Coaches would not be able to make scholarship commitments to prospective student-athletes in the contract time frame in that recruiting takes place far in advance of any current determination of financial need.

This is due to regulatory enforcement. Most decisions, in fact, are not finalized until after April 15th. The grant-in-aid eligibility determination would fall under the congressional legislative calendar, which includes annual adjustments to standards. Any attempt to get coaches' early need assessments, which currently do not exist formally, will be costly to develop and any such attempt would be preliminary in nature with limited levels of assurance for which student-athletes would be required to make institutional decisions.

Timing, professional judgment and verification of data and the defined cost of attendance would vary from institution to institution. The question of the level field, when comparing offers made by different schools, confusion and suspicion will accompany the student decision-making. Additionally, administrative complexities and pressures placed on the institution, specifically on the financial aid office, will be an integral part of the implementation of the concept.

Because most students, even those with moderate to high need, would receive less money under a need-based financial aid system, perceived opportunity for most athletes to attend institutions of higher learning would be reduced. The Special Committee on Cost Reduction was established with the specific charge of identifying the means for reducing costs in intercollegiate athletics without denying students access to higher education or significantly altering the competitive balance among NCAA member institutions. It is the committee's current position that a system of awarding financial aid to student-athletes, at least in part on the basis of financial need, would by nature deny some students access to higher education and have a high potential for offering competitive balance among member institutions and would contain a significant potential for abuse, particularly during the recruiting process. Any cost savings realized by reducing grant-in-aid through the application of need would be more than offset through additional administrative and programmatic costs.

For these reasons, the committee believes that despite the cost savings involved, the committee will not recommend further study or further consideration of the need-based financial aid assistance for athletes. The committee is, however, considering some reduction in numbers of grants-in-aid as a means of reducing costs.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[NOTE: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council was presented and approved.]

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.]

NCAA Honors Dinner

Monday Evening, January 8, 1990

President Witte: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 25th annual honors dinner. Please remain standing for the invocation, which will be presented by Joan Cronan, director of women's athletics at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

INVOCATION

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Let us pray. Our Father, we are truly thankful for this day and the many blessings and opportunities that you provide for us. We ask your blessing on this honors dinner as we take time to reflect on the past, recognize achievements in excellence and also accept the challenges for the future. Because of the many opportunities that athletics provide each of us to make an impact on society, we ask your guidance in helping us choose the path of righteousness that will lead us to still waters. Bless this food to the nourishment of our body, and it is in your name that I pray. Amen.

President Witte: Mr. President, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: I am pleased to announce that tonight we have served over 2,000 people, far and away the largest crowd that we have ever had at these honors affairs; and I consider it a personal tribute to me, or at least to some president. (Laughter)

It does not seem possible to many of us in the ballroom this evening, that tonight we celebrate our 25th honors program. We have changed the traditional luncheon to a dinner as we commemorate this special occasion. We have seen many changes in intercollegiate athletics over the past 25 years, but one constant has been the time we annually take time at our Convention to recognize current and former student-athletes who have excelled academically and athletically and who have made significant contributions to their community and to our society.

For myself, I am honored to share the head table with those whom we celebrate this evening, to participate in an event which permits us to pay tribute to both them and their accomplishments. Yesterday, Dick Schultz reminded us of the need to improve the model of intercollegiate athletics and its place in higher education. Our athletics programs are constantly under public scrutiny as they should be. We should never abate our efforts to respond to problems real or perceived.

But tonight, we put those concerns and those efforts aside. Tonight, we have the opportunity to honor individuals who represent the highest level of distinction. Through them, we honor the thousands of student-athletes, past, present and future, who they may symbolize and represent. Although tonight's honorees are representative of so many others, they are each unique. Although each of them is a person with untold devotion to achieving worthy goals, yet it is a rare treat for the rest of us to be able to share the details of their individual lives and accomplishments. To each of them we feel great pride. We are also fully aware that by permitting us to honor them, they bring great honor to us. For that and for so much more, we give them thanks.

At this time I wish to introduce a few people sharing the dais who will not be specifically acknowledged later in our program. I have been asked to introduce our secretary-treasurer. It is not easy for me to describe her objectively. She is a person of unlimited integrity, who has made and continues to make the greatest contribution to every facet of this organization. She has done so with style and grace. I am pleased to present to you Judith M. Sweet, director of athletics, University of California, San Diego, and secretary-treasurer of our Association. (Applause)

The next individual to be recognized has in a brief two and one-half years demonstrated to us all that he is the ideal person to lead this organization into the challenges of the 1990s. May I present to you our executive director, Dick Schultz. (Applause)

It is particularly fitting that we also recognize the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, the person responsible for this grand affair, former NCAA president, John R. Davis, of Oregon State University. (Applause)

I also wish to recognize a former Theodore Roosevelt Award recipient who is seated in front of the dais this evening, Vice-Admiral William P. Lawrence, who received the Teddy Award in 1984, and who also is a member of the NCAA Honors Committee. (Applause)

Now, it is a distinct honor for me to present our master of ceremonies. He is one of the nation's most respected news correspondents and has earned an impeccable reputation for integrity and honesty over the past three decades, covering a variety of news events under the public scrutiny inherent in television network news.

He began his network career at CBS News in 1956. During that time, he became an original coeditor with Mike Wallace of the award-winning program "60 Minutes" and anchored the "CBS Sunday News." He also coanchored the network's presidential election coverage, cohosted many CBS News special reports, and began the "Reasoner Report" on CBS Radio.

He then moved on to ABC News in 1970, where he coanchored a number of presidential elections and major international events, including the Emmy-award-winning coverage of President Nixon's trip to China. He also covered President Nixon's summit sessions in the Soviet Union and President Ford's visit to China.

He returned to CBS News in 1978 and is in his 14th season as a coeditor of "60 Minutes." He has received Emmy awards for looking at a decaying city through the eyes of its parish priest and another for providing a graphic report of the violence in Sicily resulting from the Mafia's control of the illegal drug traffic there. He also has received an Emmy as News Broadcaster of the Year and the Overseas Press Club of America award for Best Television Documentary of Foreign Affairs.

He has been presented the University of Missouri School of Journalism Honor Medal; the George Foster Peabody Award for Outstanding Contributions to Television News and the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Achievement Award. He was honored by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences for writing the script for the program entitled, "What About Ronald Reagan," which aired some 22 years ago.

It is possible that our distinguished honoree may wish to pose a similar question about our master of ceremonies before he leaves this evening.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome our master of ceremonies, Mr. Harry Reasoner. (Applause)

Harry Reasoner: Mr. President, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: I don't know whether President Reagan remembers that program or not, but it was a lot of fun for us and it was the first hour he had on national network television. I have to say that despite what you may hear: When I earned my first Emmy, we had a conclusion to the program, which I hate to bring up. But we said, sir, I don't know if you remember it or not, we said in the consideration of you for nomination for the presidency in 1968 that if it didn't happen then it probably wouldn't because of the age factor. (Laughter)

May I say, I am rapidly overtaking you as a senior citizen. I can now get free cab fares and subway fares and other benefits, but you are an inspiration to us all.

It is a lot of fun for me to be here tonight, just what I would like to do, instead of a nice weekend in Connecticut, is to get on a plane and go to Dallas. But it has turned out to be a lot of fun, and I can live with it. (Laughter)

I enjoy athletics a great deal. I would like to make clear that when I say I enjoy athletics a great deal is that I have two television sets. I am not in any sense an athlete myself, except for a little bit of mild tennis. I like athletes and I like to watch, and I am here to introduce things, not as a reporter, so I don't have to get involved in all the things that the NCAA is discussing. I figure once I have established this is the NCAA and not the NAACP, that would be the only reporting I had to do.

Along with many other people, I do greatly enjoy collegiate athletics and I think they should be different from professional athletics. I am happy to see that you are addressing these problems. The individuals that you are honoring tonight, apart from being personally impressive and much stronger than I am, have, I think, set a pattern

for providing a kind of leadership as role models for a lot of people. As a man who never did anything much either academically or athletically in college, I am glad somebody is worried about it. I hope you work it out. I think that it is important to this society.

I would also like to thank the NCAA for accepting my network's modest financial offer for the men's and women's basketball tournaments. I didn't realize, Judy, you were involved. You were being so nice. (Laughter) We are very happy about it. There was a little bit of grumbling when the memo came around saying that all salaries are being cut 50 percent to pay this billion dollars. But Mr. Neal Pilson said he would make it up in tickets for the Final Four, so we think it will be a good deal for CBS Sports and CBS in general, which at the moment needs it. If we have to sell this hotel, we will. (Laughter)

I was encouraged to hear Mr. Schultz talking about the responsibility that goes along with all this money in trying to figure out a way creatively to distribute the revenues in a manner that will make clear and more valuable the role of athletics in higher education. It seems obvious to me that where the award should go is to those institutions that are committed to educating young people until they earn a degree and are providing broad-based programs for men and women. I encourage you to take this opportunity to diminish rather than enhance the pressures placed on coaches and athletes and the accompanying media publicity that often focuses just on money.

Mr. Pilson told me the contract will certainly benefit our network; but more importantly, it gives a forum to all of you, too. It is easier to think about a problem if you have some resources to deal with it. This gives you the resources to demonstrate that there is a role for amateur athletics in college rather than for just getting audiences, although we don't mind if it gets audiences like that.

It is a unique group, looking down at some old friends of mine on the lower dais and out in the audience, a unique group that I am proud to be here with. I admire them.

At this time, I would like to call your attention to your program to review the biographies of the first recipients of the Walter Byers Scholarship. Each of the former student-athletes is receiving \$7,500 grants to continue their education. I also ask you to turn to the next page in your program to review the list of 100 individuals who have received NCAA postgraduate scholarships during the past year to continue their education. This program began in 1964; and since that time, the Association has invested more than \$3 million to assist more than 2,000 students in pursuing their graduate credits.

The College Athletics Top 12 program permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The criteria for each of these categories are listed in your program. Now, I take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you.

Vicki Huber, Villanova University Track and Field.

Villanova University long has had a reputation for producing world-class distance runners. Vicki Huber has done her part, and more, to solidify that reputation. Not only is she the first Villanova woman ever to compete in the Olympic Games, but she became the dominant distance runner in NCAA competition during her career, winning seven individual championships in track.

Just a few weeks ago, she established herself as America's preeminent distance runner by winning her eighth NCAA title in record time at the Division I Cross Country Championships leading the Wildcats to a national title. She is the only woman ever to win the National Collegiate Indoor Championships one-mile run and the 3,000-meter run at the same championship. What makes this accomplishment more incredible is that there is only one hour between those two races.

The 1988 Olympian also set records in the 1,500- and 3,000-meter runs, the indoor and outdoor one-mile runs; and she qualified for three events in the United States Olympic Trials. Vicki won seven of eight NCAA individual track events that she entered during her career. She finished second in the indoor one-mile run, attempting to repeat the unique double that she had accomplished as a junior.

Vicki has established a 3.380 grade-point average, majoring in psychology, and frequently has earned recognition on the dean's list. She received the Jumbo Elliott Award as the top collegiate woman runner and is only the second woman to receive the Philadelphia Sports Writers Association's Outstanding Amateur Athlete Award.

Vicki will receive her award from Ted Aceto, director of athletics at Villanova University.

John Jackson, University of Southern California, Football.

In the era when football and basketball players generally concentrate on one sport, John Jackson is unique. Not only was he an all-America receiver on the University of Southern California Rose Bowl team, he is a collegiate baseball player who will be a leading contender for similar recognition in that sport this spring.

Southern Cal, of course, has had a number of outstanding receivers; but John's name is prominent in the record book. He was one of the nation's leading pass receivers this season with 57 receptions for 908 yards and five touchdowns while earning all-Pacific-10 Conference honors. He holds USC records with 158 career receptions for 2,323 yards, and by catching a pass in 36 consecutive games, which is a conference standard.

In baseball, the two-year starter received all-West region tournament recognition by hitting for a .619 average. He was the team's leading hitter in the regular season last year with a .356 average and hit an impressive .423 in the Pac-10.

A National Football Foundation Hall of Fame scholar-athlete, John maintained a 3.300 grade-point average while earning a business/finance degree. He is currently enrolled in USC's business administration graduate school and was named academic all-America.

John will receive his award from Michael B. McGee, director of athletics at USC.

Jolanda Jones, University of Houston, Track and Field.

When one reviews Jolanda Jones' career at the University of Houston, it is difficult to determine what should receive primary consideration. Academically, she was named to the dean's list each semester, establishing a 3.730 grade-point average while majoring in political science. She was elected to Omicron Delta Kappa and plans to pursue a law degree at Stanford University.

Athletically, she was the first woman to win the NCAA heptathlon championship three consecutive years. She competed in the World University and Pan American Games and represented the United States in European competition this summer before sustaining an injury. Jolanda was the Southwest Conference champion in the heptathlon and also won individual honors in the high jump three consecutive years. She was presented the Up and Coming Award by the Women's Sports Foundation of America.

Jolanda was a student senator in student government and was elected to the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics. A member of the Southwest Conference Sportsmanship Committee, she participated on Houston's Athletic Advisory Committee and on the search committee for the director of athletics. She was chair of the Houston chapter of a political action committee of the NAACP and was a community representative of Computech, Incorporated, which works with disadvantaged innercity children.

Jolanda will receive her award from James R. Benbrook, faculty athletics representative at the University of Houston.

James S. Martin, Pennsylvania State University, Wrestling.

Do not be deceived by the mild-mannered appearance of the 5-6, 125-pound man standing in front of you, and except Dick Butkus, I don't think there is anybody on the dais who can handle him. He has been called a demon on the wrestling mat by those who have watched or competed against him. The record indicates that description may be justified.

Jim Martin set an individual record in NCAA competition during his career with 155 victories against nine losses and four draws. He won the NCAA 126-pound championship and finished second, third and fourth in NCAA competition during his career. He also established Penn State records with 168 bouts and four dual-meet victories in a single season.

He also was a "demon" academically. He established a 3.950 grade-point average preparing to enter the Penn State medical school. Jim was named Phi Beta Kappa, was inducted into the Golden Key and Omicron Delta Kappa Honor Societies, and was selected Male Student Athlete of the Year by the Division I-A Athletics Directors Association. The four-time academic all-America received the President's Award as a freshman and sophomore, earning a perfect 4.000 grade-point average, and was selected as the senior male student who best combined academic achievement with successful athletics participa-

tion at Penn State.

Jim was a volunteer for the Geisinger Children's Miracle Network Telethon and for Students Against Multiple Sclerosis. He is a member of Athletes in Action, an Athletic Ministry of Campus Crusade for Christ and participated in the organization that met special needs for youth in the community.

Jim will receive his award from James I. Tarman, director of athletics at Penn State.

Virginia Stahr, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Women's Volleyball.

It is easy to understand why Virginia Stahr was voted Female Student-Athlete of the Year by the Division I-A Athletic Directors Association earlier this year. If there had been a difficulty—and this would apply to the five other student-athletes that we salute today—it would have been in determining if she would be recognized for her academic or her athletics accomplishments.

Academically, Virginia graduated with high distinction in elementary education with a 3.907 grade-point average in the University of Nebraska's extended elementary teachers education program. A two-time academic all-America, she currently is a graduate student with emphasis in curriculum and instruction and a minor in counseling.

She is a two-time all-America athletically and was named Nebraska Athlete of the Year in 1985 after participating in volleyball, basketball, softball and track. The three-time all-Big Eight Conference tournament Most Valuable Player holds Nebraska's career record with a .404 hitting percentage, 157 service aces and 1,364 kills. Is that the bull-fighting area? (Laughter)

She has established six other Nebraska records, including season standards for hitting percentage and blocking assists. She had 26 kills in a four-game match against Indiana and served seven aces in a five-game match with Minnesota. Virginia twice has been captain of the team and has participated in two Olympic Festivals.

Active in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, the University Lutheran Chapel and the Student Education Association, she also finds time to serve as a YMCA Big Sister, coach a girl's softball team and be involved in the Best of America Say No campaign.

Virginia will receive her award from Martin A. Massengale, chancellor of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Jacob Young, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Football.

Winning football games and producing all-America linemen has become synonymous at the University of Nebraska; and with a slight slip a couple of weeks ago, basically that is true. But Jacob Young's appearance before you today adds to the foundation for the establishment of yet another Cornhusker tradition. He becomes the third Nebraska all-America center in the past six years to receive recognition as one of Today's Top Six Scholar-Athletes.

You may remember that his predecessors were Dave Rimington and Mark Traynowicz. Like those predecessors, Jake, too, was a two-time all-America and an all-Big Eight Conference lineman. But like no other athlete who has joined the Nebraska football team since 1972, he is the first offensive lineman in 17 years to earn a varsity letter as a freshman and is the first sophomore to earn a starting position on the offensive line since 1975. Nebraska has won at least 10 games and played in a bowl game each of the past four years.

Jake also is an all-America academically. He has earned a 3.400 grade-point average while pursuing a dual major in business and finance. A frequent speaker for Father/Son Midget Football, elementary school and church banquets, Jake devotes much of his time to visiting hospitals and retirement homes. He has been an active antidrugs spokesperson and has participated in fund-raising activities for muscular dystrophy and cystic fibrosis. He participates in the Special Olympics Program and in Cub Scouts and is a Madonna Home volunteer. He leaves Dallas tomorrow to play in the Japan Bowl.

Jake will receive his award from Robert S. Devaney, director of athletics at Nebraska.

Vicki Huber will respond on behalf of the current student-athletes. Vicki.

Vick Huber: Mr. President and honored guests: On behalf of the NCAA Top Six Award honorees, I would like to thank the NCAA and extend my congratulations to the other five award winners seated before you tonight. It is a great honor to be presented this award in the presence of such distinguished honorees as the Silver Anniversary Awards winners have been and former President Ronald Reagan.

The National Collegiate Athletics Association takes great pains to insure that each school and every athlete has the opportunity to compete fairly and equally under the same rules. It is unfortunate that at the international level such efforts and fairness are not matched; but hopefully in the future, the example the NCAA establishes will be followed at all levels of competition. It also is satisfying to see that Executive Director Dick Schultz recognizes the financial needs of athletes and has proposed many new ideas that will provide the athletes with additional support and services.

On behalf of the team I represent, I would like to thank the NCAA for permitting women's athletics programs to develop as they have in the past decade. The competition has provided not only opportunities to travel and to meet people but also is a way in which we express ourselves. If we were denied the opportunity to perform and compete at the levels of which we are capable, we would not be complete people.

Congratulations to all the award winners, and I thank the NCAA for providing the athletes the opportunity to fulfill both

our goals in the classroom and in our sport. Thank you.
(Applause)

Mr. Reasoner: Thank you, Vicki. We also congratulate you and each of the other honorees.

Now, we get to the old folks.

Donald E. Baxter, Mercer University, Basketball.

When world-class distance runners sustain injuries, Dr. Donald E. Baxter is one of the first people to know. Over a relatively short period of time, Dr. Baxter has established an international reputation as a leading expert on foot and ankle injuries. And world-class athletes, from distance runners to sprinters, including 1983 NCAA champion Joaquim Cruz, who won the 800-meter run in the 1984 Olympics; Francie Larrieu Smith, and gold medal sprinter Carl Lewis, credit him with improving their performances through medical rehabilitation.

For instance, he performed corrective surgery on Cruz in 1982; and a year later, Joaquim set a United States record at the NCAA Track and Field Championships before winning his gold medal in 1984.

An active marathon runner himself, Dr. Baxter has been treating these injuries for athletes and ballet dancers since completing his internship in orthopedic surgery at the University of Texas hospitals. He earned his medical degree at the University of Georgia in 1969 and received a Surgery of Foot and Ankle Fellowship at the University of California in San Francisco. He has been associated with the University of Texas, Austin, medical school since 1974, first as an orthopedic surgeon and then as director of the Foot and Ankle Fellowship.

Active in a variety of civic and charitable activities, he is the company physician for the Houston Ballet; a lecturer for the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, and chair of the Texas State Neurofibromatosis Foundation Board. He served on the Hospitality Committee of the 1984 Olympic Games and has donated countless volunteer hours to other amateur and professional sporting events.

A graduate of Mercer University, the Rhodes scholar finalist was vice-president of the senior class. He was a four-year starter in basketball, played in the orchestra and shared a room with Mercer's first black student. He was selected to Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities, a member of Blue Key and averaged in double figures for both rebounds and points scored his senior season.

Dr. Baxter will receive his award from Kirby Godsey, who is the president of Mercer University.

Paul William Buca, United States Military Academy, Swimming.

Paul Buca often has been described as a quiet, intelligent, successful real estate developer who graduated from the United States Military Academy. But those who know of his military

record call him a war hero of the highest honor. His military contributions are summarized by a description that reads in part: "Using flashlights in complete view of enemy snipers, he directed the medical evacuation of three air-ambulance loads of seriously wounded personnel and the helicopter supply of his company." That was when he received the Congressional Medal of Honor from President Richard Nixon in 1973.

He graduated from the Military Academy 18th in a class of 593 students and earned a bachelor of science degree. He also was commissioned a Second Lieutenant of infantry, but he enrolled in the Stanford University Graduate School of Business and earned a master's degree before becoming a member of the famed 101st Airborne Division. He quickly was promoted to Captain to command a rifle company in the fast-moving combat operations of modern air mobile warfare. Before he had completed his Vietnam assignment, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and Air Medal, the Army Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm, in addition to the Medal of Honor.

He returned to West Point as an assistant professor of managerial economics and became involved in a diversity of interests, which included founding his own real estate company and the MIL International Mutual Fund and lecturing on business and government ethics at Harvard, Princeton and the service academies among other institutions.

Buddy is a trustee of the Intrepid Sea and Air Space Museum Hall of Honor, the American Leadership Forum and the Jersey City State College Asian Institute. He is a director of No Greater Love, serves on the Parks and Recreation Council, is president of the high school Booster's Club and a member of several military-related organizations.

He earned three varsity swimming letters at West Point and was captain as a senior. He twice earned all-America honors and held West Point records in both the 200- and 400-yard individual medleys. He set a collegiate record in the 200-yard medley and also swam on a national freshman record 400-yard freestyle team.

Before I say who is going to give him his award, I would like to quote President Truman. President Truman said they (Medal of Honor winners) are the only people whom everyone salutes. I suspect Lieutenant General Dave Palmer, superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, will do that when he gives you the award.

Dick Butkus, University of Illinois, Champaign, Football.

Somebody was saying during one of the football games over the weekend, if you don't know what stress and pain are, I can tell you how to try to go past Dick Butkus. His sport, I believe, was football. He was one of the best linebackers, maybe the best, in the history of college football. It is doubtful anyone ever thought that he someday would be a theatrical actor capable of portraying sensitivity and a gentle demeanor. His outstanding performances in both intercolle-

giate and professional football need no embellishment but always will attract it from those who enjoy recounting the glory years of a great athlete. The respect he is earning as an actor is providing the foundation for continued evaluation of his participation on a different playing field.

Dick was a two-time consensus all-America linebacker, who placed sixth and third in the Heisman Trophy balloting while leading the University of Illinois to a Big Ten Championship and a Rose Bowl victory. He was named the Player of the Year by the American Football Coaches Association. As team captain, he twice led the conference in tackles, averaging 14.5 as a junior and 14.9 per game as a senior. He was a first-round draft selection by the Chicago Bears and earned all-NFL linebacker honors seven of his nine years. He twice was named National Football Conference Defensive Player of the Year and football fans named him pro football's all-time greatest linebacker. He was selected to the NFL All-Decade Team of the 1960's, and to the Big Ten Diamond Anniversary Team in 1970.

He retired from professional football and began pursuing an acting career with the same enthusiasm and determination that had earned him distinction in sports.

Dick will receive his award from John Mackovic, director of athletics and head football coach at the University of Illinois, Champaign.

Brigman Owens, University of Cincinnati, Football.

The quality reputation that Brig Owens established at the University of Cincinnati and with the Washington Redskins has become completely overshadowed by his commitment to youth in America. These activities began when he started a campus Big Brothers program as an undergraduate at Cincinnati while simultaneously providing a paternal commitment to four young people until they became adults. He was elected to the prestigious Metro Group for his campus, academic and community achievements.

Brig became the first player in Missouri Valley Conference history to earn repeat honors on the all-conference team. He led Cincinnati to championships his junior and senior seasons, while earning national rankings in rushing yards, total offense and scoring. He began his professional career in Dallas, when they had a team here (Laughter), and moved to Washington a year later. He played in 154 consecutive games and still holds career records with 36 interceptions, 686 interception return yards and interceptions returned for touchdowns.

The former defensive captain also was the team's player representative for seven years and was instrumental in developing financial planning, career-counseling, employee-assistance and substance-abuse programs for the players association.

He earned a doctorate of jurisprudence from Potomac School of Law and was the assistant director and associate counsel for the NFL Players Association for five years before forming a comprehensive career-management services firm in 1984. He has developed a drug-prevention program called Super Teams in the Washington metropol-

itan high school system. Brig also implemented a youth development program for the National Football League Players Association that raised more than \$10 million, which earned a Department of Education citation as one of the exemplary programs in the nation. He also is a vice-president and trustee of the Leukemia Society.

A published author, Brig serves on the Boards of USA Telecommunications and the National Bank of Commerce. He also served on former Vice-President Walter Mondale's Task Force on Youth Employment, the Central Caribbean Task Force and the Pan American Development Foundation.

Brig will receive his award from Joseph Steger, president of the University of Cincinnati.

Arthur J. Roberts, Columbia University, Football, Basketball and Baseball.

When Archie Roberts graduated from Columbia University, he was committed to pursuing a career in professional football, and more importantly, to entering medical school. He had all the experience that he needed delivering newspapers, which he faithfully had done before his first class each day, and knew there had to be a better way to finance his education. To no one's surprise, he found a way to meet each goal. Archie had earned all-Ivy honors three consecutive years at quarterback and maintained a B average in premedical studies. Archie was one of the first student-athletes ever to letter in three sports, baseball, basketball and football, at Columbia.

As a quarterback who also started on defense, he led the nation in pass-completion percentage as a junior; was second as a senior, and ranked nationally in pass completions, total offense and scoring. In baseball, he earned first-team all-America honors and still holds the Columbia career record for a .371 batting average. He was selected New York Metropolitan Player of the Year and reportedly 18 of the 20 major league baseball teams offered him a contract.

He received the Swede Nelson Award for Sportsmanship and the Morningside Brotherhood Award for volunteering to instruct children in the Harlem area. He signed a unique professional football contract that required the Cleveland Browns to finance medical school expenses for both him and his wife at Case Western Reserve and excused him from joining the team until he had earned his degree. Very good.

Archie played two years of professional football with Cleveland and Miami. He received a Traveling Fellowship at the Yale University Medical School in 1971 and then became a clinical associate at the National Heart and Lung Institute. He served on the faculties at Cornell University Medical Center, Northwestern University, the University of Nevada and the University of Florida before becoming chair of the department of cardiothoracic surgery at Boston University.

He has been director of cardiac surgery at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, chair of the Heart Institute of Northeast Pennsylvania and professor of surgery at Temple University since 1987. He has done

major research in myocardial protection, developing improved alternatives to protecting the heart during cardiac surgery. He has pioneered an innovative method of delivering cold blood to the heart during open heart surgery.

He received the Columbia Alumni Association's Award for Distinguished Achievement and is active in the affairs of his local school board, the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame and numerous professional societies.

Archie will receive his award from his former coach at Columbia, Aldo Donelli.

Roger T. Staubach, United States Naval Academy, Football, Baseball and Basketball.

Most everyone knows that Roger Staubach got the Heisman Trophy while representing the United States Naval Academy, but many may not be aware that he also lettered in baseball and basketball. His baseball career, like John Jackson's, was almost as impressive as were his football performances. He was an outfielder and pitcher who had a .420 batting average as a sophomore and led the team in runs batted in and stolen bases as a senior.

But it was football that was his sport. He led the academy to a No. 2 ranking in the country and a berth in the 1964 Cotton Bowl, while establishing 28 Navy records. Roger received the Maxwell and Walter Camp Memorial Trophies, along with the Heisman, which identified him as college football's most outstanding player. Roger is the only three-time winner of the Thompson Trophy Cup, which is presented to the midshipman who has done the most during the year for the promotion of athletics at the Naval Academy.

Some skeptics were surprised that the Dallas Cowboys drafted Roger following his senior season realizing that he had a two-year commitment of service to the Navy before he could consider a professional football career. Those same skeptics, however, became unidentifiable after Roger joined the Dallas team in 1970. The team captain led Dallas to a 90-31 record between 1971 and 1977; and the Cowboys won two world championships, winning 14 of 20 postseason games with Roger at quarterback. He led the National Football League in passing twice, was selected to the Pro Bowl five times and was the most valuable player in Super Bowl XI.

He was the NFL's most valuable player and the Vince Lombardi Sportsman of the Year. He received the prestigious Field Scovell Award from the Dallas All-Sports Association and the Brian "Whizzer" White Humanitarian Award, among numerous others during his professional career.

He is a real estate and commercial land broker, and is extremely active in the Dallas community. He is on the board of directors of a number of companies and organizations, including the Greater Dallas Chamber of Commerce, the Lena Pope Home and the Dallas County Advisory Board of the Salvation Army. He has received the Medal of Honor from the Daughters of the American Revolution, was the Dallas J.C.'s Man of the Year, and is active in the Fellowship of

Christian Athletes and the Young Presidents' organization. Roger was inducted into the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame in 1981 and the Professional Football Hall of Fame in 1985.

Roger will receive his award from Rear Admiral Virgil L. Hill, Jr., Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy.

Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Honorees is Roger Staubach.

Roger Staubach: Well, thank you, Mr. Cronkite. (Laughter) The Cowboys are coming back, Harry, I promise you. I want to, of course, thank everyone representing us out there—that is family, that is friends, that is athletics directors and presidents of universities. We appreciate your support in being here tonight. Of course, the athletics director of the Naval Academy is Jack Lengyel. I also thank Admiral Hill for coming from the Naval Academy to present me with my award. I also thank my family. They have endured, I think 25 years, and I do have another silver anniversary this year with Mary Ann. It has been fun with sports on the field and being married to her 25 years made it fun off the field as well. So I thank all of the families that are here on behalf of the recipients.

It is a distinct honor to be selected for this Silver Anniversary Award of the NCAA and a special privilege to be speaking for the honorees this evening. We have a rather unique gathering in this room tonight; because out in the audience, we have distinguished representatives from areas such as politics. We saw a lot of politicians tonight and business people and sports.

I think it is interesting to note that we are all here to discuss a common goal of achievement. Athletes want to experience it, businessmen want to reward it and politicians, of course, they want to tax it. (Laughter) That is excluding President Reagan, who didn't want to tax anything. (Applause)

Our group of six has various interests, including medicine, business and the arts. It is hard to believe that 25 years have passed since our college days. Back then the Dow was 900; a cotton shirt at Bloomingdale's was \$5.50, according to my statistics anyway, and you could buy a new Oldsmobile for \$3,500. In fact, about the only things that have been reduced in all those years really is my endurance and my memory.

A lot has happened in 25 years. While we six might share different backgrounds as former athletes, we have much in common. We understand the role athletics has played in our lives. Sports can be a common denominator and an important tradition in life, especially at the stage in a young person's development when so many choices are available.

It is tough being a young adult today, maybe tougher than when we did it. It seems that there are more options, more temptations, more distractions; but in a changing world, one thing that remains the same is the beauty and the simplicity of athletics competition. Nothing can match the satisfaction of setting a goal, making sacrifices while preparing and giving total effort during competition.

I know that at the Naval Academy I learned something that has been very important to my life as a midshipman as well as an athlete, and that is the word "perseverance." You know, you just can't quit in life. No matter how tough it is, no matter how hard it is, you can't quit. Harry Truman said, "It wasn't the crisis that mattered, it is really how you handle the crisis." We all need perseverance. I was taught perseverance as a midshipman and I was taught perseverance as an athlete. When you get knocked down, you have to pick yourself back up no matter what you are doing in life.

Of course, here in Dallas, I have been in the real estate business and I have been on the board of a bank. We have teenage daughters and I am a Cowboys fan, so you need a lot of perseverance. (Laughter)

Today, more than ever, athletics can be a stabilizing influence that helps filter out distractions; and in proper perspective, sports can help develop a well outlook on life. I say that because I believe there is a very powerful development side to athletics, particularly at the college level. We often talk about the relationships we build with others, the sense of teamwork that is part of everyday success. We speak of the discipline we learned and the memories and friendships that become part of our lives. What we are really referring to is an educational process that augments what we learned in the classroom. Sports gives us the chance to learn more about ourselves than otherwise would be possible, define our limits, test and expand our limits. Sports gives us a chance to see things we would not ordinarily see. In short, they give us a tremendous advantage in life.

I cannot hope to speak what is in the heart of each recipient tonight. We all are honored and we are honored to be selected. We appreciate very much the support of those people and institutions who have been instrumental in our careers. But the awards you give us here are so much more than individual achievements. They are a reflection of the NCAA and all of the programs that teach, coach and counsel young people today. They honor the process that provides experience and education far beyond that which otherwise would be available. We are the recipients of that rich tradition.

We can only hope to use the knowledge we have gained to further the message of what the NCAA stands for and what it means to us as individuals. On behalf of our group, we thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Reasoner: Thank you, Roger. Congratulations to you and your outstanding colleagues.

Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

If you will open your program to Page No. 5, you will see pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a variety of athletics awards in college, has exemplified ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

It is a very high-level group, including, as you will note, former

presidents and the current President of the United States, military leaders, educators, pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition. Although I am sensitive about providing for you any introductory information beyond the obvious for this year's Teddy honoree, I know that you are looking forward to viewing the video.

It has been wisely reported that Ronald Wilson Reagan received his nickname at birth in Dixon, Illinois. While howling from the doctor's spanking, his father, John Edward, who was a clerk in a general store, said to his mother, Nelle, "For such a little bit of a fat Dutchman, he makes a hell of a lot of noise, doesn't he?" From that moment, he has been called "Dutch," I believe.

You may know that he was educated in Illinois public schools and was graduated from Eureka College in 1932 with a degree in economics and sociology. You may not be aware that he earned varsity letters in football, swimming and track and was a cheerleader for the basketball team.

His involvement in government began at Eureka. He served on the student senate two years before becoming president. He waited tables and did other odd jobs to earn tuition money to supplement his scholarship, and he also was active in drama and was treasurer of Alpha Epsilon Sigma National Dramatics Fraternity. He had a role in a play that earned Eureka a third place nationally, and our honoree received honorable-mention recognition for his character portrayal.

Following a brief career as a sports broadcaster and editor, he moved to California to pursue a successful career in motion pictures, which was interrupted by three years of service in the Army Air Corps during World War II. He had roles in 53 feature-length motion pictures; served six terms as president of the Screen Actors Guild, and at that time was a Democrat, I believe, and twice provided similar leadership to the Motion Picture Industry Council. From motion pictures, he went into television in the 1950s as production supervisor and host of "General Electric Theater" and "Death Valley Days."

In 1966, he began his public service career. He was elected governor of California by nearly a million-vote margin. He was named chairman of the Republican Governors Association three years later and was elected to a second term as governor. He became the 40th President of the United States on November 4, 1980. Four years later, the Republican Party once again unanimously selected our honoree as its presidential candidate. He easily won reelection, carrying 49 states, and was sworn in for a second term at the 50th Presidential Inaugural on January 20, 1985.

It is interesting to note that the latest five Republican Presidents earned varsity letters at NCAA institutions. Aren't there any Democrat athletes? (Laughter) They were President Eisenhower, West Point; President Ford, Michigan, who learned how to chew gum (Laughter); President Nixon, Whittier College; our honoree played football, and President Bush represented Yale in the College World

Series in baseball.

As in the case with many of our former presidents, the man we are honoring today may have a bigger place in history after he leaves this nation's highest office. Each of you is aware of all the things that have happened in the last four months, and I was hoping to get a chance to ask the President whether he was happy to be out of office or wishes he was in office during what has been going on since August. He has been responsible for some of the steps, some of the atmosphere that has led to the events of the last four months, and I salute you for that, Mr. President.

With that, I present to you the 40th President of the United States of America, the Honorable Ronald Reagan.

President Witte: Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present the Teddy Award for 1990 to President Ronald Reagan. May I read the inscription on this plaque: "Recognizing your superb undergraduate career as a student and an athlete, and your continuing dedication to the highest personal standards, this award is presented to Ronald W. Reagan, Eureka College, Class of 1932, for your significant contributions to the motion picture industry, your leadership in state and national affairs as the governor of the state of California, and your dedication to the preservation of democracy and world peace as this nation's 40th President. January 8, 1990, Dallas, Texas." (Applause)

President Ronald Reagan: Nancy has my football sweaters from Eureka. Wait until I come home with this. Thank you, Harry; thank you, Albert Witte.

I am extremely filled with mixed emotions and I am tremendously proud of the honor that you have bestowed on me. But at the same time, I am truly humbled when I think of all the greats in athletics who have come before me. Add to this the six recipients honored tonight for their current achievements, and the six that are Silver Anniversary Awards, and I realize I am in distinguished company.

Indeed, all of us up here are honored by the more than 2,000 of you educators and athletics administrators who make up this most distinguished audience. All of us owe a debt to the NCAA for the part it plays in keeping college athletics and education in a proper relationship. Some of us can remember a time when there was a threat of over-emphasis on sports to the detriment of education. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has taken care of that.

The Association chose Theodore Roosevelt's name for this award program, which brings us here tonight. His concern for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics led to the formation of the NCAA in 1906. He was a strong supporter of physical fitness and the benefits of competitive sports. I am also happy to be here to be able to talk about something that is older than I am. (Laughter) You have been told I did attend a small college in Illinois, and it was the oldest coeducational college west of the Allegheny Mountains. If I had to do it over again, I would go to the same school, Eureka College.

My major was in economics and sociology, but you have been told

that. I am afraid that came second to football for me. Eureka was in a conference called the Little Nineteen, and it was unquestionably the smallest school in that conference. Some of our opponents had 10 times our enrollment, and there were no such things as athletics scholarships. The school saved all the campus jobs that it could for needy students. I didn't find that unpleasant. One of my jobs was washing dishes in the girls' dormitory. (Laughter)

The coach, Ralph McKinsey, was a graduate of Eureka and had played football there. The school used to display the front page of a Peoria newspaper on the administration building bulletin board. They displayed it there because of a two-inch headline across the top of that page which read, "McKinsey beats Bradley 52 to 0." That is Bradley University. The paper was there because he had made every one of the 52 points, touchdowns, points after and field goals. I am ashamed to say that I got off on the wrong foot. I thought he didn't like me. I came from a high school that was several times bigger than Eureka; and I guess, you know, that turn from senior back down to freshman, I guess I thought I should automatically make the varsity. But he knew what he was doing.

In my second year, I finally made varsity at right guard; and at the same time, I came to realize that he was a great and good influence on me. He knew what he had been doing all the time that I thought he just didn't like me. He still lives in Eureka. He is in his nineties; and up until a few years ago, he was out coaching Eureka's wide receivers.

You do know, of course, that in my day you played both offense and defense. In my junior and senior years, I averaged playing all but three minutes of every game. In those dark Depression days, we had a number of fellows who had gotten out of high school in the Roaring Twenties, had gotten those good jobs that were available then. Then the crash and the Great Depression came. The jobs were gone, and that was almost like the post-war heroes of football. Suddenly, many of these fellows decided that rather than just sit around unemployed they might go back and try college. In my last year, I was the only one of the top first eleven who had come directly from high school to college.

The tackle beside me was 28 years old. One night during a chalk talk in one of the classrooms, Coach Mac somehow brought up the subject, I don't know how, of prayer in football. Well, now, I sat there silent. I never would have told any of those older guys, those teammates of mine, but I never faced a kickoff that I wasn't silently saying a prayer. To my surprise, as the conversation went on, I learned that every man in that room prayed before the kickoff. Now, I never thought I had a right to ask the Lord to take sides and ask for a victory. I prayed there would be no injuries and that I would do my best and that I would have no regrets however the game turned out when the game was over. To my surprise, as the conversation went on in that room with all those fellows on the squad, I found out that was the gist of very prayer by every one of those teammates. It was quite an eye-opener to me.

But, then, you must have gathered by this time that I loved football. It is the only sport in which men engage in a bodily attack on each other that is in truth the closest thing to war without the hatred and death that takes place in war. You charge at each other; you fling yourselves through the air bodily and take down an opposing player before he can do the same to you. There is no other sport quite like it. It is a total physical contact and, as I say, without hatred or death.

You know, I have always been struck by something about college sports, really sports in general, that I would like to share with you. When the men and women competitors put on their uniforms and walk out on the playing field, socio-economic stations disappear. It doesn't matter whether you are black or white, Christian or Jew; it doesn't matter whether you are rich or poor; it doesn't matter which side of the tracks you come from. It just matters that you are out there doing your best, and that same equality is not restricted to the playing field. It is in the stands, too. The only thing that matters is the team you are rooting for. A corporate president can be seated next to the janitor who cleans the office at night, and they are cheering together for the home team. They are high-fiving each other on a touchdown and booing loudly when a bad call is made.

In those few precious moments, it doesn't matter who wears pin-stripes and who wears overalls, which makes me wonder why it should matter at all. I have often wondered if there is not a way somehow that we could capture that spirit of togetherness and, yes, brotherhood and have it be the guiding light of our lives after the games are over, too. Wouldn't that be something?

I thank you for the honors that you have given me tonight. I couldn't find words to express how I really feel. I just know that I always will be grateful and I will always remember this particular occasion. God bless you all. Thank you.

President Witte: Thank you, President Reagan. You, too, have made this a memorable evening for all of us.

Now, I am pleased to present to George A. Hearne, President of Eureka College, a plaque commemorating this day for Eureka College. (Applause)

Mr. Reasoner: Well, I have had fun. Haven't you? I am glad I was invited here, and I congratulate again each of our honorees. I admire the Association for recognizing these individuals and for grappling with the problems of what to do about amateur athletics in college. I thank you for permitting me to be here this evening. Thank you. (Applause)

President Witte: This has been an enjoyable evening for me, and I also wish to thank Mr. Reasoner for his outstanding job as master of ceremonies. As a token of the Association's appreciation for his serving us so ably tonight, I am pleased to present to him this gift of crystal.

Mr. Reasoner: Thank you. That is a good-size martini glass. (Laughter)

President Witte: Now, if you will please rise, Joan Cronan will

offer the benediction.

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Let us pray. Our Father, in closing we again thank you for providing us with such a meaningful and special evening. We are pleased with the opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of the honorees tonight and ask that your continued blessing be on them.

We ask your guidance for the NCAA and are thankful for the outstanding leadership that you give us, for truly you are the only one perfect administrator. We ask you to help in making us understand that no one cares how much you know until they know how much you care, and that is what is so important to us in dealing with our young athletes.

Bless us as we attempt to be good role models and accept the challenges of the 1990s. In your name we pray. Amen.

General Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 9, 1990

The 84th annual Convention general business session was called to order at 9 a.m., with President Witte presiding.

President Witte: Will the delegates please take their seats. The general business session is now open. When we opened our session Sunday afternoon, I announced that the first order of business this morning would be to receive motions today to act upon various reports. At this time I would entertain a motion to receive the reports of the sports committees and the general committees of the Association as presented to you in the Annual Reports.

[NOTE: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and standing committees, treasurer, Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[NOTE: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

Consent Package

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal Nos. 1 through 23 in the Consent Package

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, these proposals have been included in the consent package because the Council considers them to be noncontroversial. Each has the Council's full support; and on behalf of the Council, I urge the adoption of this legislation.

[NOTE: Proposals Nos. 1, 7 and 12 were removed from the consent package.]

[Proposals Nos. 2 through 6, 8 through 11 and 13 through 23 (Page A-3) were approved as a consent package.]

Sports Sponsorship Waiver

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): I move we adopt Proposal No. 1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will codify current administrative practice and grant member institutions additional time to compile the information necessary to support the three sport sponsorship waivers

described in this proposal.

Douglas Kahn (University of Michigan): The concern we have, and it may be very easily answered, is that if a waiver is granted, and it is granted that late, that will drop the sport of field hockey, and a school may have scheduled with other teams, wouldn't that cause a lot of problems with the other teams on the schedule? It may be, as I said, easily handled; but that is the reason for our concern.

[Proposal No. 1 (Page A-2) was approved after being removed from the consent package.]

Enforcement—Prospective Student-Athlete

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Infractions and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a matter that has come to the attention of the Committee on Infractions in some recent cases. It involves prospective student-athletes who subsequently enrolled at a member institution, not a prospective student-athlete who subsequently enrolled in institutions not part of the membership.

We have had instances wherein the students have been involved in some rather serious allegations, have been interviewed by the enforcement staff and by institutions that are under investigation and have knowingly provided false and misleading information that has seriously impeded the investigations. These people subsequently have enrolled at a member institution, not necessarily the one under investigation; and the result has been that it has been the committee's interpretation of the legislation that we cannot reach those students and they have been able to go free.

It is the position of the committee that we believe it is the intent and desire of the membership that such students not be permitted to knowingly give false and misleading information and thwart the will of the legislation, particularly relative to recruiting and extra benefits. Therefore, it is our desire to have us provide for prospective as well as all student-athletes.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to inquire of the Infractions Committee: Is that relevant to providing information or is that relevant to bringing the rules of this organization to all prospective student-athletes before they are being considered enrolled?

Mr. Williams: This will deal with the period, generally speaking, at the end of the recruiting period when there are investigations that may well be going on. Usually, this would mean that in the spring or summer in the year before entering college. It would apply to them for very specific matters that would clearly be beneficial to them.

Mr. Rienzo: If that explanation is considered part of this legislation, that will be fine.

[Proposal No. 7 (Page A-5) was approved after being removed from the consent package.]

Core-Curriculum Requirements—Deadline

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 12—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, the Pac-10 Conference realizes that Proposition 12 does not confirm a present interpretation but rather, in fact, provides for the first time the opportunity for student-athletes or prospective student-athletes to take their core-curriculum requirements following high-school graduation. The way the original amendment was proposed allows the core requirement to be completed at any school following high-school graduation, rather than the institution from which the prospective student-athlete has graduated.

The intent of the amendment-to-amendment 12—1 is to require that the prospective student-athlete completes the core requirement at the high school from which the student has graduated, and we believe that this would reduce possible abuse of this legislation by preventing shopping for some institution that would allow a student to be able to complete the core requirements and perhaps not a core that has been certified by the original high school. Thank you.

Mr. Hobbs: Mr. Chair, the issue that was just raised was also a concern of both the Academic Requirements Committee and the Council. I think, No. 12—1 answered it.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I have simply one question. I very much agree with the rationale for stiffening the requirements that these students take certified courses. The question I would ask is this: are all high schools going to be enthusiastic about having the students who have already graduated come back for another term? If you are a principal of a high school and you have heavy enrollment, I am not so sure this is going to be positive.

Len Roitman (Brooklyn College): Mr. Chair, considering that these students have graduated, if a student has moved, how is this student going to be able to go to the original high school and meet the core-curriculum requirements if the student resides in another area, whether in the same city or a different city? Are we going to pay for his commuting?

Mr. Hobbs: Mr. Chair, I think the answer to that query would be if the student was constrained to move, if the student could demonstrate a hardship before the Council subcommittee on initial eligibility appeals there has always been a remedy for a problem.

[Proposal No. 12—1 (Page A-9) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Hobbs: Mr. Chair, the thinking of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Council reflects their view that the purpose of Proposal 48 was not to tarnish prospective students, rather

to insure that students entering intercollegiate institutions were adequately prepared academically. We already allow a student who has graduated from high school to take the standardized test after that time; and if that students meets the minimum standards, he or she will become a qualifier when he or she enters a collegiate institution the following September.

A number of members requested of the Academic Requirements Committee consideration allowing some sort of relief for that student who did not meet the core-course requirement prior to graduation. On balance, we thought that this would be equitable, and again I call attention to the fact that the student will have to sit out until the following September. The student may not enter an intercollegiate institution immediately. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 12 (Page A-8) was approved as amended by No. 12-1, after being removed from the consent package.]

RECONSIDERATION OF DIVISION VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football (45)

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): Mr. Chair, I voted on the prevailing side on Proposal 45 during yesterday morning's Division I-AA business session. I now move to reconsider the adoption of that proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 45, as adopted, would be effective beginning with the 1990-91 academic year. The original intent of the sponsors of Proposal 45 and the mistaken belief of some of those that voted in favor of 45 was that the proposal would not be effective until 1991. The proposal, as adopted, currently would place many Division I-AA institutions in the unfortunate position of having to retract financial aid offers currently outstanding for any potential athletes and students on campus. I strongly urge the membership of Division I-AA to support reconsideration of Proposition 45 with the expressed intent that the same legislation be adopted at next year's Convention with a more reasonable effective date.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): We were among those who supported this proposal, believing it would not take effect until next year. We agree with those that move for reconsideration in the view that it should not be adopted in mid-stream and should be brought back next year.

Benny Hollis (Northeast Louisiana University): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal 45. In addition to the problems that we have in this proposition that Edgar Johnson just mentioned, during the 1991 Convention we understand that the cost-reduction subcommittee will be bringing us a new package. Possibly, we will have reductions in scholarships or other reductions at that time. It seems inappropriate and not in the best interest of I-AA football to make these cuts at this time, especially since the fact that we have gone out and made commitments and incurred recruiting expense. We put a serious handicap on our coaches. I strongly urge that I-AA delegates consider defeating this

proposal.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I would strongly urge that we defeat with a vote of "no" Proposition No. 45 in concert with the reality that the assembly already has made a decision to turn this issue over to the purview of the cost-containment committee. Let's wait for the deliberations of that body to materialize and evolve relative to what happens next year. During the interim, vote "no" on Proposal 45.

Dave Hart Sr. (Southern Conference): I would like to caution the I-AA membership that football staffs have been out making early commitments; and in doing so, most likely consideration of this legislation is not part of their presentations to the prospects. Now, this could really put coaches in an embarrassing spot. It could also lead to a coach telling several youngsters on the signing date that this body passed legislation prohibiting him from awarding a scholarship to that particular youngster because he has to cut some people from his original list.

I have two suggestions. One, defeat this legislation because of the way it is written and bring it back next year. Two, think of waiting until, as it already has been mentioned, the cost-containment committee brings it findings back. Let that be your guide in taking action rather than doing something so abruptly at this time.

[Reconsideration of Proposal No. 45 (Page A-55) was approved.]

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley Conference): I am rising to support Proposal No. 45. Proposal No. 45 is proposed simply to contain the cost of operating in Division I-AA football. It was the only cost-containment measure that was passed at this Convention. It is not suggested that such an amendment is a panacea to the financial problems of I-AA football, but simply a step to assist I-AA football to a more comfortable institutional cost level.

Since the 1984 United States Supreme Court decision invalidated the NCAA television plan, most I-AA football programs have lost revenue in two ways. First, the invalidation of the plan cancelled television revenue that used to trickle down to the I-AA level. Second, paid attendance has decreased at a majority of schools because of the numerous football television broadcasts available at no cost to former I-AA spectators. Still football-playing institutions since that time have attempted to fund their programs at the same grant-in-aid levels.

A reduction in grants-in-aid suggests that I-AA football programs need to maintain members as close to other I-AA football programs as possible in order to play them and to recruit against them.

In regard to playing guarantees, institutions at the I-AA level should consider whether it is fair to require student-athletes to play in a game in which they have little or no chance for victory and a good chance for injury, all for the sake of money. In response to the recruiting argument that was submitted earlier, very few, if any,

prospective student-athletes have turned down grants-in-aid offered at Division I-A schools in order to play at I-AA institutions.

Now, I-AA football is a meaningful and worthwhile activity at all conference institutions, but I-AA institutions do not need to compete with a I-A football program in funding. Those institutions that wish to do that should consider moving to the I-A level and not interfere with the attempts by I-AA to contain costs. It is the view of the Ohio Valley Conference that the effective date of this amendment does not cause a reasonable hardship and the amendment should be supported as it was yesterday. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-55) was defeated by Division I-AA after a successful motion to reconsider.]

Reconsideration in Division I-A of Contact and Evaluation Periods Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (107)

Peter T. Dalis (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chair, having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 107, the contact and evaluation periods for Divisions I-A and I-AA, I move for reconsideration in Division I-A only on the basis that this particular piece of legislation is going to impact significantly the cost of doing business in intercollegiate athletics. In the spirit of cost reduction, we feel that this ought to be defeated and passed on to the NCAA committee relegated to deal with cost containment in the future. We urge you to defeat this proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

Michael B. McGee (Southern California University): I think it is helpful to note that in our conference when our coaches considered this legislation and the problem of taking our coaches off campus during the period for October when our students are on campus, they voted unanimously in opposition to this. I think the motives here are clearly worthwhile, and we should reconsider this legislation.

Tom Osborne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I would like to address the economy measure here. I believe that this proposal does eliminate 15 days of recruiting in May, which would involve the entire staff. So you send nine or 10 people on the road for 15 days, that is considerably more expensive than to send your staff out for four nights in October. I was with the coaches when the football coaches were polled, and they are in favor of this.

No one wants to have their people sent to Chicago or Miami for a Friday night event, going several thousand miles. The intent is to go locally within a 50- or a 100-mile radius and having the people back. I realize there are some who may decide to make extensive commitments. I think the overall impact of the legislation, however, will be to reduce cost and allow those schools that do not have a chance to see high schools play because play-offs start in November to do so; and if you can't go out and see them play in person in October, three-fourths of the schools in many states are not playing football later than that. It is helpful for the evaluation process to see people play in person on occasion.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 107 (Page A-102) was defeated by Division I-A, 43-64.]

Reconsideration of Division II Baseball (97)

Frederick R. Berger (St. Joseph's College (Indiana)): As a member of Division II, I voted on the prevailing side of Proposition 97, and I would like to move for reconsideration of No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am not sure that all of the Division II understood what we were voting on yesterday. When the proposal was made and voted on, it was indicated that it has already been passed in Division I and it is on the board for Division III. I might mention to my colleagues in Division II that Division III defeated its proposal, Proposal No. 98, yesterday. If my interpretation of this is correct, this means that our baseball coaches can play as a team during the summer. The 26-week playing period is now confined to the academic year. Is that interpretation correct?

President Witte: Yes.

Mr. Berger: I also might mention that at the Division II business session yesterday, it was indicated that since Division I already has this in effect it would be great to put it in effect at the Division II level. I might mention that I don't think we necessarily at the Division II level have been thinking that because Division I passes it that we have to pass it. I might indicate that we are a separate division and that what is good in Division I is not necessarily good in Division II. I would encourage my colleagues in Division II to defeat this proposal.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 97 (Page A-92) was approved by Division II.]

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-92) was approved, 91-59.]

Reconsideration in Division I-AA only of Contact and Evaluation Periods—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): Mr. Chair, I voted on the prevailing side in Division I-AA on Proposal No. 107, and I would like to ask that I-AA reconsider this in light of what I-A has done.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, No. 107 passed in Division I-A and failed in Division I-AA yesterday. I am not sure that we in I-AA were aware of I-A's vote at the time we voted. As it stands now, this would make a difference in evaluation periods between the two divisions and often-times we are recruiting the same student-athletes and watching the same game. This would put us at a further disadvantage. I don't think it is good for I-AA; and while I don't favor 107, I think it is more important that we be consistent and that we don't further complicate the rules and have different evaluation periods for I-A and I-AA. I would urge I-AA to pass No. 107.

Lawrence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): The Division I-AA membership also should pass No. 107. This would allow the

coaches to have an opportunity to evaluate personally the size of the prospects during their competition with the vast majority of high-school football games currently being played on Friday night. Current legislation simply does not provide ample evaluation opportunities.

It should be noted that there are certain geographical limits on many schools and prospects. The pressure of this proposal would greatly alleviate these limits and all the institutions throughout the country would be on equal footing in evaluating prospects, specifically those institutions that have prospects in the northern tier of the country. Passage of this proposal will allow them to evaluate prospects competing in many high schools where the football season is over by late October or early November.

Although the issue of increased costs associated with the recruiting is a valid consideration, the argument that it would significantly increase costs is misleading especially on the Division I-AA level. This would be used predominantly to evaluate local prospects in the field. For all these reasons, we urge support of No. 107 for the Division I-AA membership.

David R. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): I urge that we vote in favor of Proposition 107 on the basis that most of us are regional institutions. We recruit locally, and this will increase the effectiveness of our recruiting. It will also reduce the cost of our spring recruiting. I think it is good legislation and I urge you to vote for it.

[The motion to reconsider in Division I-AA Proposal No. 107 (Page A-102) was approved by Division I-AA.]

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-102) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Reconsideration in Division I-AA of Football Recruiting Contacts—Divisions I-A and I-AA (106)

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): Having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal 106, I would like to move for reconsideration in Division I-AA only for the same reasons basically as 107. No. 106 was adopted in Division I-A, and it was defeated in I-AA by a vote of 44 to 47. I don't believe we were aware of the Division I-A vote at the time. This would make for different contact periods between Divisions I-A and I-AA.

As I stated before, the rules are complex enough that we don't have to make them more complex by having different rules between the divisions. I don't think this is going to make a great deal of difference one way or the other, but in the spirit of consistency, I would urge I-AA to pass 106. I move for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 106 (Page A-101) in Division I-AA only was approved.]

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-101) was approved by Division I-AA].

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Admissions and Graduation-Rate Disclosures—Divisions I and II

William E. Tucker (Texas Christian University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 24, and I do so speaking for the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair and delegates: prior to the 1989 Convention in San Francisco, the Presidents Commission reviewed legislation pending in Congress to require institutions of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance to provide information concerning the graduation rates of student-athletes at those institutions. The Commission took the view that Federal intervention in this area was not necessary and resolved to prepare appropriate NCAA legislation for consideration during this Convention.

Proposal No. 24 fulfills its commitment and the Commission thinks and believes that the proposal is far preferable to the provision of the student-athlete's Right-To-Know Act sponsored by Senators Bradley and Penner. This proposal would require Division I and Division II member institutions to report admissions and graduation data to prospective student-athletes and their parents and to high-school and two-year college programs, and to the NCAA, which would publish the information by institution.

The annual reports will contain information concerning the admissions standards applied both to student-athletes and to students generally for the previous academic year, as well as graduation rates for the two groups, using the foremost recent graduating classes, excluding the class that graduated just prior to the October 1 date. The average graduate rate would be calculated in two ways for each group: (1) by means of a defined graduation rate, which will account for incoming transfers and exempt other students who left the institution in good standing, and also those who did not graduate but who continued to make satisfactory progress toward a degree, (2) by means of an undefined rate in which like-defined data would be based upon a five-year time frame but would not take into account any of the factors noted in one above.

The report also requires institutions to supply information concerning the average time for typical undergraduate students to graduate and the graduation rate of student-athletes who exhaust athletics eligibility. As is the case now in Division I, failure to submit a completed report by the October 1 deadline would result in the institution's ineligibility for NCAA championship events. The first report, using the rolling averages, would be due for Division I in 1991. The first reports of the Division II institutions would be due in 1994.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Chair, let me put the matter in academic terminology. We either take this action for ourselves or we shall have it done for us. If it is done for us, so to say, it will be done to us.

In behalf of the Presidents Commission, I, therefore, urge the delegates to support Proposal No. 24.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, as a member of the Presidents Commission, representing the Division III presidents, I would also rise in support of this motion and urge its adoption. The Commission, including all of the presidents, indicate that we do think that failure to adopt this motion will invite Federal intervention into what is something that currently is controlled by the member institutions.

Secondly, I would point out to the body that the data that are requested would be for the prior academic year. It would not require that you give information on individuals that are coming to your institutions as of that August or September. You have a year to collect the data. It should be easy for the institutions to do so once the procedures are in place. A second point I would make to you is that for Division II institutions, many of which may not have data capability as sophisticated as Division I institutions, the effective date for this legislation would be 1994, which should give us ample time to come into compliance. I urge your adoption of this action.

Charles E. Young (UCLA): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 24—3.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, this proposal would amend Bylaw 30.1.1.2, which is labeled "Individual Student-Athlete Data." The problem that is presented by 30.1.1.2 is that being included as it is in this total provision, the data reported there to the NCAA must now be released publicly by institutions. Without some modification, it is my opinion and those of my colleagues in the Big Ten, and I believe generally shared by the Presidents Commission in discussion day before yesterday—although we didn't have an opportunity in the Presidents Commission to look at the specific legislation—that the reporting as currently provided in 30.1.1.2 would make it very easy to identify certain individuals whose data would be contained in the report.

What is done in Proposal 24—3 is to cast that data in a form that would make it impossible for individual data to be ascertained or taken out of the report for individuals.

[Proposal No. 24—3 (Page A-21) was approved by Division I (311-9) and Division II (173-6), roll-call votes.]

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to move adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 24—4.

[The motion was seconded.]

Amendment-to-Amendment No. 24—4 is intended to call to the attention of the Convention the fact that Bylaw 31.1.4-(b) specifies that information be provided on the basis of race. While I am aware of the fact that some individuals in some groups are very anxious to have that information reported, the fact that the overall graduation rates of the institutions are not race distinguished in "A" as they are required in "B;" therefore, it does not provide you with con-

sistent data that may be evaluated from athletes to the average student body.

Therefore, you have incomplete race-distinguished information provided by the graduation rates. I am not supportive of the fact that any information should be reported on the basis of race. However, I am aware of the fact that some individuals would prefer to have it that way. However, statistically providing race-distinguished data in one place and one in the other is inaccurate statistical information. Therefore, I would encourage you to remove race by adopting No. 24—4 this year, and then, if necessary, come back next year and put race back in in the graduation rate of all students if you need to have it in the graduation rates of athletes.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): With all due respect to the comments made by my distinguished colleague from Georgetown, I would urge that the delegates take a position in opposition to No. 24—4 for the following reasons.

In the last 24 hours there have been arguments opposing and also supporting the concept of giving us time to secure needed data on many substantive changes. Concurrently, I have heard a number of arguments, particularly yesterday in Division I-AA, designed to accept the proposal until "we" have sufficient time to research and to evaluate said data.

Well, it would appear that, once again, we are off and running with the request to exclude a significant portion of missing data. If, in fact, as educators we believe that research and data have value, then we would urge that there is no need for us to rush the judgment on No. 24—4; and on that basis because of the emphasis upon the data matter, oppose and, therefore, defeat No. 24—4.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): The student-athlete's Right-To-Know Act that is pending before Congress will require the publication of institution's specific information on graduation rates by race as well as by gender. If we don't amend with No. 24—4 and remove race from those calculations, I believe that that could well yet move the Congress to pass its bill, because it believes that this Association has not met its full obligation. I, therefore, would speak against Amendment-to-Amendment No. 24—4.

[Proposal No. 24—4 (Page A-21) was defeated by Division I (80-243) and Division II (43-156), roll-call votes.]

Steve D. Milburn (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): The academic advisors support this legislation, because we are all aware of the external dynamics surrounding this issue. However, we do have concerns as do many others about the methodology employed to arrive at these figures, especially since academic advisors on many campuses are the people who actually do this report.

One concern is that significant amounts of time and resources will be required to do this reporting, time that might otherwise be spent assisting students. Additionally, the academic advisors have

concerns about how these rates will be explained in light of the current data on transient higher education, particularly when some institutions find that their athletes graduate at a higher percentage than their general student body. If passed, we hope that academic advisors will be consulted regarding the collection and dissemination of such data. Thank you.

Margaret Gatz (University of Southern California): I wish to bring to the attention of this Convention an interpretation received from the NCAA staff. It is on the Bylaw 31.1.5. This is the definition of graduation rate. For purposes of this definition, for the defined rate, the students who leave the institution while in good standing are not included in the rate if, and only if, they have eligibility remaining. If students leave the institution in good standing after completing their eligibility, they are included in the defined rate. They are in the denominator. I would appreciate, then, if the chair would please confirm this interpretation.

President Witte: The interpretation has been approved by the Council.

James E. Delaney (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President, I rise in support of No. 24. We were also concerned about methodology procedure in implementing this provision. In an effort to provide consistent and comparable data, we urge that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers be called upon to develop methodology for the calculation of graduate data. The members of this organization possess the expertise to insure the use of accepted practices in collecting and reporting the student information.

[Proposal No. 24—A, B and C (Page A-16) was approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 24—3. Part A approved by Division I, 323-3, and by Division II, 166-7, roll-call votes. Part B approved by Divisions I, 322-2, roll-call vote. Part C approved by Division II, 175-6, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Donald W. Zacharias (Mississippi State University): On behalf of the Southeastern Conference, I move that we refer Section D to the NCAA Council for the purpose of further refinement and clarification through consultation with the appropriate on-campus representatives and the national accrediting bodies.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, we have heard considerable discussion already that indicates that there probably was not the level of consultation needed to fully implement the statistics that we want to publish widely. We are supportive of the disclosure of the graduation rates and we want to implement that in the best possible way. We recognize that this statistic is going to have major national importance and it is appropriate that we consult those individuals who will be involved directly in making very significant interpretations on each of our campuses. I realize that it is easy to say that counting is a simple process, but I think you have already heard enough reservations, statements of potential problems and needs for interpretation.

Rather than have a loose system, I think it is more appropriate to begin by having the NCAA Council directly involved. Through that process, we can have the appropriate consultation with registrars, directors of admissions and faculty representatives to be sure that we carry this out in the right way. So let's commit ourselves fully to the disclosure, and let's also do it in the appropriate way. I urge adoption of this motion.

Steve D. Milburn (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): I certainly endorse what President Zacharias said and the comments that were made by Commissioner Delany were very appropriate in terms of the involvement of academics, admissions people, registrars and so forth. I again urge, as I stated previously, the involvement of academic advisors, also, as a group of people who belong with those other fellows, people who work with student-athletes on a daily basis. Thank you very much.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Even though No. 24—4 was resoundingly defeated on the floor of the Convention, I still think it would be a serious mistake for this Convention not to pass No. 24-D. Those of you who have had the opportunity to visit Washington know what we go through in Washington with the intrusion of the Federal government. To have the Federal government come into the workings of intercollegiate athletics and the NCAA would probably be one of the most serious mistakes that this Convention would have made in its entire history. You will notice that the effective date is 1991.

Even though we must begin compiling data immediately, the effective date for giving the first report is 1991. Therefore, it would be possible to correct some of the positions that may need to be tinkered with during the time before the first report is made. Therefore, I would encourage you to defeat this referral motion and also to adopt 24-D.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the motion to refer. I think it is very clear that this is the guts of the resolution of No. 24. If you defeat D, you are defeating the resolution. I think it is very clear that before we get together again Federal legislation will have been adopted that will accomplish this in a much worse fashion than we possibly could imagine at the present time. Further, this does not go into effect until August 1, 1991. If there are changes that need to be made to it, they can be made either by the Council following the provision that is now possible, given the adoption of Resolution No. 4 earlier today, or it can come back to the Convention in 1991.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): I encourage the defeat of the motion to refer for all of the reasons cited above. I think again this is the guts of the proposal. If there is a problem with the definition or the reporting regulations for a Division I institution, there is ample time for that to be corrected by consultation, at least by the next Convention or by the Council, if that is necessary. And for Division II schools, we have until 1994

before the data are required. I urge your defeat of the motion to refer.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 24-D (Page A-17) was defeated by Division I, 20-305, and by Division II, 11-169, roll-call votes.]

[Proposal No. 24-D (Page A-17) was approved as amended by No. 24—3; Division I, 320-4, and Division II, 178-6, both roll-call votes.]

Spring Practice—Division II Football

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division II Steering Committee believes this proposal strikes a reasonable compromise between the concept of reducing spring football practice that is supported by the Presidents Commission and others to reduce the time demands on the student-athletes and the need to preserve the teaching opportunity for the football team outside the competitive season. The number of practices is substantially reduced from 20 to 12 and contact is prohibited. The restrictions on contact are the same as those during the first three days of fall practice. In addition, the amount of time, practice time each day, including meetings, is limited to a period of two hours. The steering committee believes this is in response to the student-athletes' call for more time to be regular college students and still provide adequate time for a meaningful out-of-season training period. The steering committee urges your support of this proposal.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Representing the Division II Presidents Commission, it was our understanding when the Executive Committee of the Council and the executive committee of the Presidents Commission met in October that what is presented in No. 31 was what we agreed to. When we saw the writing, it was different than what we had understood was coming out of that joint session. So the Division II Presidents Commission members are in support of Proposition No. 31 and encourage your "yes" vote.

Frank Cignetti (Indiana University of Pennsylvania): Mr. President, I speak in opposition to this piece of legislation and strongly encourage the Division II membership to defeat Proposition No. 31 and to consider Proposition No. 30 and its amendments-to-amendments, which will make contact permissible in 10 of the 15 permissible practice sessions. My rationale for this is that many of our colleagues, in supporting the reordering of Proposition No. 31 on Sunday, were not aware that the amendments-to-amendments permitted contact during spring practice would be forthcoming. Passage of Proposition 31 will rule out the possibility of contact in spring practice in Division II. I encourage the Division II membership to defeat this proposition. Thank you.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I would point out to my colleagues in Division II that both the proposal that came from the Division II segment of the Council and the one that came from the Division II segment of the Presidents Commission eliminate contact in spring practice. I would urge my colleagues to support No. 31. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-42) was approved by Division II, 82-36, after being moved ahead of No. 30.]

Playing and Practice Seasons

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, I am president of Arizona State University and chair of the Division I subcommittee of the Presidents Commission. I wish to move Proposal No. 30, the proposal to reduce time demands on student-athletes by limiting the play and practice seasons.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, the Presidents Commission, in concert with the NCAA Council, believes that Proposal No. 30 will be substantially strengthened by the adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—11; and, therefore, I wish to move a reordering of the sequence of consideration, since Proposal No. 30—11 applies to Part G, and move that we consider Part G first.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to reorder consideration of the parts of Proposal No. 30 to consider Part G first was approved.]

Mr. Coor: Mr. Chair, for the past 18 months, this Association, in concert with groups throughout the nation, have studied the question of the role of the student-athlete on our campuses. The National Forum that we have had for the past two years, the study conducted under the auspices of this Association by the American Institutes for Research have come forward with a loud and clear conclusion Intercollegiate athletics, especially football and basketball, place far too great a time demand on the student-athlete. That study, the AIR study, shows that in football and basketball more time is spent on their sports by athletes in those two programs than in class and preparing for class combined—approximately 30 hours a week.

Indeed, in the AIR study there was a clear consistent cry from the student-athletes, please allow us to compete actively but please also reduce the time demands. As one football player said, "As a student-athlete, I need 30 hours each day just to be equal with the regular students." Another athlete said, "It is difficult to find time to concentrate on both academic and athletics and do the very best I can."

The Presidents Commission has considered this data, where in football and basketball it was identified separately, and acknowledges that in the other sports where it is grouped, we should take a specific first step at this Convention. This proposal is very straightforward. By resolution, all sports that have time demands on students should be studied. But for football and basketball, where we

clearly know the evidence based on the studies to date, spring practice should be reduced to 10 days, no contact permitted, and that the basketball season should be reduced to 25 games with a starting date for conditioning on the 1st of October, a starting date for practice on the 1st of November and a starting date for the season on December 1st.

Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—11, which I wish to move for consideration by this Convention, would allow every university one exception every four years to participate in the set of activities, tournaments and others currently embraced in NCAA legislation: the NIT Tournament, the Great Alaska Shootout, Hawaii and other activities. There are other amendments, I realize; and there is no single perfect solution. But on behalf of the Presidents Commission, we urge adoption of Proposal No. 30—11; and with it, we urge action today on the full Proposal 30. There has been a substantial amount of consideration given to this issue, and we believe it very clearly is time to take specific steps. Thank you.

[The motion was seconded.]

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chair, Proposal 30 has no fewer than 13 proposed amendments-to-amendments, all of which are roll-call votes. Consideration of Part G before Part A, with its amendment-to-amendment 30—1, may waste considerable time if the wish of the Convention is to refer Sections B through G to committee to iron out the obvious problems with those sections. I, therefore, move that we reorder the agenda to consider Proposal 30-A prior to 30-G, and then Parts B through F.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to consider Part A ahead of Part G and part G ahead of Parts B, C, D and F was approved.]

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I move the adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent behind Proposal No. 30—1 is to include football and basketball in a comprehensive plan for all sports. The presidents have indicated the need for our expertise in athletics administration in developing standards for sports other than football and basketball. We believe that our expertise is especially needed in football and basketball. I agree with President Coor that there is a clear message that the Presidents Commission has sent with regard to Proposition 30 and that our student-athletes believe there is a pressing need to reduce the time demands we place on them.

The Presidents Commission has seized this information from the AIR report and has mandated the Association's administrators to develop and implement a plan to accomplish this objective. This message has been sent and it has been received. The time demands of student-athletes will be reduced. The Commission has sent the popular advertising message, "Just do it."

Prop 30, without Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—1, is a

very incomplete proposal relating to only two sports—football and basketball. Frankly, it is the approach to reducing time demands as identified in President Coor's comments that bothers me. It is somewhat lacking, in terms of tackling the cost of reduction by only talking about cutting scholarships and coaches. The Presidents Commission itself already has substantially altered its original position regarding Parts C, D, E and F of this proposal. Today the delegates will be asked to consider nine modifications on the other two remaining proposals. If nothing else, the fact that every portion of this proposal has had numerous modifications, clearly indicates that there is a substantial difference of opinion regarding how our mission to reduce time demands can best be achieved.

Proposal No. 30—1 calls for the appropriate athletics interest group to develop a complete proposal to encompass all sports, to be coordinated with the reports of the cost-containment and Student-Athlete Advisory Committees. This all-sports package will be presented to the Presidents Commission and the membership in the same general time sequence called for by the Commission. There is no delay in implementation of reforms as requested, nor is it expected. Having the experts consider the problem in greater detail may produce the same problems currently in Prop 30 and could include other standards such as a quiet period and prohibition of competition during exam periods, limitation on three-day practices, even film reviews, summer work-outs, and nontraditional-competition segments, numbers of contests on class days.

The list could go on and on. The activities that cause our athletes to feel a time squeeze are varied and complex. Our solution must be as creative as these activities that have created the problem. If our amendment is adopted, you will be asked subsequently to refer Parts B through G to the identified interest group to develop and implement a time-reduction practice for all sports, a plan following the same time line identified by the Presidents Commission, a package treating the underlying cause of the problem with meaningful solutions, not nit-picking visible targets of little real impact that causes problems from other areas of our athletics programs, such as reduced scheduling opportunities and revenue loss.

For those of you who have been directed to support Proposition 30, I believe that Proposal No. 30—1 accomplishes that objective. Nothing is being rejected, nothing is being delayed. Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—1 only asks for the ability to assemble the expertise to present a solution that treats the problem once, a solution which is consistent across the board, not a potpourri of divisions that varies from sport to sport. Creating an effective solution without endless debate and roll-call votes is in your best interest. I urge your adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—1 and subsequent referral of Parts B through G. Thank you. (Applause)

Paul Hardin (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—1 and suggest another way in which we might expedite our action today.

That is to reject this and other amendments that would weaken or soften the impact of thoughtful action that has been taken by the Presidents Commission.

As I oppose this amendment, and to avoid boring you with other speeches, let me indicate the intention of my delegation from my university to oppose all amendments that will delay or soften the impact of or reduce the effectiveness of the Presidents Commission's report. The very fact that the Presidents Commission had first made its report to the Council, interested groups, modified its proposals, brought them here thoughtfully, I think has put us in a good position to go ahead and support our Presidents Commission.

This is an opportunity to vote for some measures that will soften the demands on our student-athletes, not because the U.S. Congress is standing ready to do it if we don't, but because it is right. I suggest that we have had good leadership from our Presidents Commission, and we should support fully their recommendations and resist this and other amendments that would denigrate that strong proposal. Thank you.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I speak in favor of the amendment. I think this is very necessary. The demands of sports other than basketball and football can be much more substantial and can be higher and considerably more adverse to the academic interests of students than football and basketball. I could give you some examples, but I think all of you can give them yourself. I think the only reason this thing has addressed football and basketball by the Presidents Commission is because those are higher profile sports. I think that we need to drop back to a more comprehensive involvement, and I believe that amendment appropriately proposes that. Thank you.

Mr. Coor: I wish to oppose the amendment. For those who believe that your judgment to support Proposition 30, as you studied it on your own campuses and came prepared to act here today, and, as was suggested by the mover, that supporting 30—1 accomplishes the same purpose, I would urge you to understand with clarity that Proposal No. 30 has very specific features for football and basketball. Those would not be enacted if this amendment were passed. I urge its defeat.

Sam Jankovich [University of Miami (Florida)]: Mr. President, I speak in support of No. 30—1, and I really believe that we do have an awfully lot of people in this room. We have two very important committees, the restructuring committee and the cost-reduction committee, working very hard on a number of issues—playing and practice seasons being one. We do have some problems, and everybody in this room is for reform. But in order to make decisions, we have to look at the entire picture, and we really have to see if we are addressing the issues that are proper. Spring football and its 20 days, I don't believe that is the problem. But maybe the number of hours put in a particular day might be the problem. If we take a look at the grades of these young people, they improve significantly

in the spring. I do not believe that there is a study out there that addresses and says that during the spring our academic progress drops substantially or our involvement improves.

Secondly, we talked about college basketball and we, of course, talked about attendance. We are not involved in a conference tournament. We say, let's reduce the season by three days but you still can have the tournament up front. And you can still have the conference tournament at the end of the year after you have established a champion through your regular league play. We can reduce it (the schedule) by three days, but every school in this room will cut the games that are very incidental without that much pressure. If we really want to address the problem, let's address the pressure season. There are many other problems as far as time goes.

If we are going to really do it right, let's look at the big picture and stop offering always to legislate college football or college basketball. Let's take some time because we have a gentleman leading a committee on cost reduction and playing season, Gene Corrigan, who has been there. We all have participated in that survey. I think that we would be making a gross mistake today to deal with No. 30 and not depend upon the study and what we will be doing a year from now. Thank you very much.

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): Mr. President, I want to oppose the efforts to defer any longer taking some honest steps to improve the situation of our student-athletes. We have spent a long time in thoughtful deliberations, sponsored by the Presidents Commission, to discuss these issues thoroughly before this body and over a long period of time. This has been followed by a careful and thoughtful study. The principle being articulated by the proponents is that because we cannot do everything today we should not do anything. There is plenty more to be done, yes, for football and, yes, for basketball. The report of the AIR studies segregated the other sports. We do not yet believe that we have adequate legislation. I think this is an important statement of principle that this Convention is about to vote. I urge you to support this thoughtfully proposed legislation.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the motion to adopt No. 30—1. My friend, Mr. Jankovich, said there are many committees that are involved with various aspects of the business of this Association which ought to be heard. The Presidents Commission is also a very important part of this Association. The Presidents Commission has on its own initiative taken the last two years to take a look at the situation, to sponsor a series of Forums and sponsor the research that has been done that has led to the material that now makes it possible for us to move forward on this.

The Presidents Commission is composed of representatives of many of the major conferences throughout the United States. I believe it is representative of all the regions, the large and small

institutions. This has been given very great deliberation. The Presidents Commission has not brought this frivolously before you. I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 30—1 and move on to No. 30 and overwhelmingly support it.

Walter R. Peterson (Franklin Pierce College): Mr. Chair, I am the Division II representative on the Presidents Commission. I rise to oppose the pending motion. I would point out to the delegates that the reason that action is indicated here on football and basketball is because in the studies that were taken in the football and basketball, student-athletes clearly indicated that the time demands on them were too harsh and that there was a very real need to provide more time for student-athletes to study and to integrate themselves into the college community. This is a watershed issue, strong issue of principle; and I would strongly urge all of the delegates to vote this down and support Proposition 30.

William L. Cords (Marquette University): We are receiving excellent leadership from the Presidents Commission and our presidents, and we truly wish to follow and will follow that leadership. The most effective decisions and the most effective legislation that this Association produces is when it has all of the information before it. I speak in favor of 30—1, because in that manner, this body will have all of the pertinent and all of the necessary and all of the needed information before it to make a very effective positive statement on behalf of our student-athletes. Thank you.

Thomas Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I would like to just reject the idea that voting in favor of 30—1 somehow thwarts the effort of the Presidents Commission. You will notice that the effective date on most of this proposal is 1992, which means there will be at least two NCAA Conventions before the effective date of any proposal here. I also would advocate that the football player's lament that he needs 30 hours every day just to survive is not sufficiently helped by simply cutting off 10 days of spring football practice. The basketball player who may have a similar lament I don't think is necessarily helped much by extended trips during vacation periods, as most of these run three days.

The problem is much bigger than those two minor, partial resolutions in football and basketball. We are including football and basketball in all of the deliberations, and we are going to bring back meaningful resolutions to the problems of the time demands on our student-athletes in football, basketball and all other sports. They will be back by next Convention in plenty of time to implement whatever effective date in 1992 was envisioned. I think we can do it. We can build on what has been proposed and do it better and do it once and for all for all sports. We urge your support of 30—1.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Presidents Commission and the cost-reduction committee. I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment-to-amendment. This is a watershed decision for the NCAA. We have well-documented data for the time demands of our football

and basketball athletes. After two years of study, the Presidents Commission has made substantial recommendations in these two sports and calls for deliberative study in the remaining sports. All of us has been involved in Conventions where we make annual refinements to a policy direction. It is time for the NCAA to take action on the original Proposal No. 30, with its modifications of football and basketball, and to proceed with the refinements as they are needed and further reform, as necessary, those sports and all other sports. Thank you.

Douglas A. Dickey (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): It seems as though you are dealing with a matter here not only about the student-athlete but about finances. You have a significant reduction in basketball games in which a number of amendments have been given to give those back to you at some time. You don't know whether you are going to get those back now or not. You are talking about some number of \$250,000 maybe at some institutions from the reduction of dollars that flow. That is a significant amount of money.

I think a number of presidents have supported the fact that this is an issue that has had a significant amount of debate to it. The passage of this will not bury anybody. Yet, it will not take away the money that you presently have until you have had the entire study being done of economic impact and the reduction of time for students involved to put together, and out of that you will get the right thing. Thank you.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I intended to wait and discuss this issue when the particular was brought up, but it appears that the debate on the entire Proposal No. 30 is taking place now because this is seen as a pivotal issue. So, I will mention a few concerns I have.

I am concerned about the academic aspects of this proposal. I am in complete sympathy with the extension of the proposal to reduce the time demands upon all of our athletes, not just basketball and football. However, I am concerned that this particular proposal will not do that. For example, in our particular institution—I presume we are not unique in this—we usually start basketball, the week before our final exams for our fall quarter on December 1st. We then have a dead week.

We have a week of final exams, or eight days of final exams; and it is usually December 15th before that period is over. During that period of time, we try very hard to try not to schedule any athletics contests. This would put a tremendous burden on institutions like ours if, in fact, we had to schedule all of our games between December 15th and about March 2nd or March 3rd. In that period, of course, is also Christmas, New Year's and other traditional holiday periods. So, I would see this as compressing the season in a way that would be very harmful for our particular athletes in our particular situation.

I also am concerned that there is an idea apparently for moving

back from October 15th to November 1st to start a practice, and somehow this will be conserving time for athletes who are going to be studying. It is my experience and the experience of many of my colleagues, in fact, that student-athletes were spending as much time or more time outside of the official practice season on their sport than they do in those official practice seasons. So, I don't see this proposal as one under which those aspects I have discussed as actually achieving the end it was intended by the Presidents Commission.

I would like to amplify the comments by the previous speaker, too, about cost to the institutions. Many institutions like ours, of course, have to fund their athletics program entirely out of resources other than resources donated by the state. The state of California to the university system doesn't provide resources for athletics. That means revenue generated in other methods to fund our program. I am chair of our Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Board, and as such, I feel responsible for providing adequate resources for the entire athletics program. Naturally, in our cases, we don't have a Division I football program.

The majority of those resources have to come from revenue generated by revenue-generating sports. Translation means basketball at the present time. This proposal would not adequately be achieving the goal that it hopes to achieve in reducing time demands on the athletes. It would, in fact, reduce our opportunity and, in fact, our revenues for support of our entire athletics program on the order of several hundred thousand dollars. In our budget, that is a big thing. I see no reason to proceed with this kind of proposal when it is obvious that there appears to be flaws in it when we can delay a complete study and have a proposal before us in the near future.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I have mixed feelings about this proposal. No. 1, I enthusiastically support the idea that the Presidents Commission is espousing. We must give these kids more time away from football and basketball. I have deep concerns as to whether this approach to spring practice is actually right, and I will speak about that if this proposal fails. On the other hand, it is a little bit incomplete as I look at it as a football coach.

Some of our problems are certainly in spring practice; we could take some time like that. But we have not addressed the out-of-season conditioning and all of the time-consuming things that our kids have to go through. So, I have mixed feelings about this, whether we ought to push it back and think the whole thing through as to how much time. I think Dick Schultz mentioned this: We ought to look at the out-of-season programs and come back from a bowl trip. Our kids came back from vacation yesterday, and they will be away until next week. You know, it goes on and on.

I had guys like Mike Reed who had a lead in a thespian production, and we had a guy by the name of Steve Donn, who is our vice-president in charge of student affairs who is captain of the football

team and also vice-president of the student government. Those days seem to be gone. They don't seem to have that kind of time. That is not spring practice. We had spring practice in those days and those guys were able to do that. There are other things involved in it.

I guess what I am saying to you is that I wholeheartedly support what the Presidents Commission wants to do. I hope that if this proposal would pass, it would not discourage them.

On the other hand, I don't think that what we are going to go through in the other sections of Proposition 30 is really going to come down to getting the thing done completely. I know this is a start and I know that we can argue that there are a couple of good things and hope we are going to get more goodies down the line. Basically, I am concerned that we don't walk away from this because we eliminated a little spring practice. If that is going to solve some of the problems that we have as it relates to the time that the kids have to put in good time college football, it's good.

Ted Finman (University of Wisconsin, Madison): Mr. President, I urge defeat of 30—1. The argument for it, simply stated, is that 30 as it stands, is incomplete and imperfect. Once you state the argument, its absurdity becomes apparent. I dare say we have never had anything before us, nor has the Congress or other legislative bodies, that is complete and perfect. Life is imperfect. If perfection and completeness are the criteria we use in deciding whether to take action, we would never act. Everybody outside this hall understands very well that we have studied this matter long enough to take action, which will be not the final word but at least a beginning. Let's show them that we understand that, too.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I am concerned about what my colleagues spoke two minutes ago about, what I perceive to be an academics matter and again talking about money. I am reminded of what President Hearn said the other day. If you are going to mix, if you are going to talk about academics and then start talking about money, you are talking about apples and oranges. I see this as an academics matter. We should not worry about the specifics, but the direction that we want to head. So, I urge my colleagues among faculty representatives to defeat 30—1 and pass No. 30 so that the message we are sending to the student-athletes out there is that we have listened to you. We don't have a perfect solution at this moment, probably never will, but the message is less time in the athletics facility, more time in the library. So I urge FARs to defeat 30—1 and pass 30. Thank you.

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern College): Mr. Chair, we certainly support the Presidents Commission and we stand shoulder to shoulder with them in the fight to reduce time that our students are actively involved in athletics. This proposal will not reduce the time significantly. There is a cry in the wilderness from those who are on the line, those who are coaches, those who were our student-athletes who know that this will not significantly

reduce the time. We have better ideas.

We know about our coaches who coach three times a day. We know about the nights in the fall and that we need to eliminate this and that so that our students can be studying. We know about our conference tournaments that take three to four days at the end of the season, usually before finals. We know that we have athletics contests before our finals and during our final period when a student-athlete should be studying. We have better ideas. We think that this is a strong issue of principle, and this is a watershed decision. We would like to do it right, and we think we have better ideas.

I urge that you vote for the amendment to study this, and that we do get to the meat of the subject, and we do reduce the time that our athletes are spending in athletics competition. Thank you.

William E. Davis (Louisiana State University): I would like to state that while I agree with the intent of the Presidents Commission, I take strong exception to the specific remedies proposed. I do not think they have been thought out enough. I think that the proposed solution for basketball schedules as addressed by a previous speaker does not speak to the issue, because I think that proposing to start the season at the very time that the final examinations are scheduled and starting up in the respective institution will not solve the time-reduction problem.

I also take strong exception to the fact that contact in spring football has anything to do with time, and that should not be a part of this issue. I strongly support the proposed amendment on the basis that it would involve the parties concerned with getting together and working out these specific issues and coming up with more specific proposals that could better address the problem.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): It seems to me that the real point of Tom Yeager's proposal, whether it passes or not, is the same point that Joe Paterno made with regard to football and the same point that other speakers have made with regard to basketball. That is, the proposals currently in 30 that apply to these two sports are really similar. We have acknowledged that. The Commission acknowledges that, the coaches acknowledge that, and the Council members and Association members acknowledge that. Whether 30 passes or not, whether 30—1 passes or not, the real objective for us is to finally finish the process that we have begun; and that is to come to grips with how we want Division I football and basketball to work and what kind of lives we want our students to live while they are playing football and basketball. That seems to me is what we need to try to do in the very few months before the deadline for legislation for the 1991 Convention. If we can do that, whether 30 passes or whether 30—1 passes, we will have accomplished far more over the next 12 months than anyone believes that we can, and it will be a real credit to us.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chair, I

am speaking in favor of 30—1. We all know that our current approach to limiting playing and practice seasons is flawed. We have tried to compress the number of days available for practice in playing football and basketball to a lesser degree than other team sports. We have found that our coaches have responded by practicing more hours per day, thus putting even greater pressure on our student-athletes.

Yet it appears that we have not learned our lesson if Parts B and G are any indication of the approach the Presidents Commission thinks we should take in all our sports. No one doubts the sincerity of the commitment of the Presidents Commission toward reform in collegiate athletics, but the Presidents Commission needs to do what it does best and that is to macromanage, leaving the micromanagement to the various expert groups who will bring back solutions.

Let's pass the amended resolution so B and G would be referred to various expert groups and bring it back to us next year and get on with the rest of our agenda.

[Proposal No. 30—1 (Page A-32) was defeated, 363-383, roll-call vote.]

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 30, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I rise to support my colleague with regard to the efficacy of Proposition 30—A. I also would like to commend the Convention for its decision to defeat 30—1. I think it is important for us to keep in mind two things that relate to the representations by President Coor and the rest of us in the Presidents Commission. No. 1, the documentation produced by the AIR survey totally develops the reality that in a final analysis the kids have to be the winners and they have said on a resoundingly yes basis that we have to have less time devoted particularly in the areas of basketball and football. No. 2, contrary to the comments made earlier, as pertains to No. 30—1, which we have just defeated, as defined by Commissioner Yeager, this is watershed legislation. It is not inconsequential, and it is absolutely imperative that we now once and for all get on with it.

Thirdly, I think that it is important for us to recognize the fact that the very reason why the Presidents Commission, Mr. Chair, has made the decision to get involved in the micromanagement end of this spectrum is the reality that the mess that big-time athletics is in today is related to the fact, at least in part, that we as CEOs were reluctant for some years to involve ourselves in anything other than macromanagement.

Let's get on now with macro and micro. On that basis, I would very strongly support the positions taken by CEOs Hearn, Hardin and Coor, and strongly urge that we say "yes" with respect to the issue before the house. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 30, Part A (Page A-32) was approved, 710-33,

roll-call vote.]

[The meeting was recessed at 11:55 a.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 9, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with President Witte presiding.

President Witte: Delegates, please take your seats. I believe a majority of the delegates have either taken their seats or are in the process of doing so. We are still on Proposal No. 30. Specifically, we are on No. 30, Paragraph G, which was reordered. We also are dealing with Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—11, which has been moved and seconded.

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): The Presidents Commission, in conjunction with the NCAA Council, believes this is a noncontroversial type of amendment that is designed to permit once in four years the kind of exemption that has existed. It incorporates major contests currently written into the legislation, and we believe it does strengthen the overall initiative and will not undermine the basic principles in any way.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): Mr. Chair, before we get involved in the details of this amendment and the amendments that may be forthcoming, I would like to make a motion to refer Proposal Nos. 30-C, 30-E, 30-G, for Division I only, and if appropriate, 30-B—that is divided I-A and I-AA—to the NCAA Council for further study.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am making this motion as I commented on No. 30—1 earlier, and I don't want to reiterate all my earlier remarks. But I am very concerned about the academic aspects of these proposals as currently conceived. I am very much in support of the faculty athletics representatives finding ways to effectively reduce the pressure and the time demand that we have on our athletes. I am, however, concerned that these proposals don't do that. I would very much rather see, in fact, in Division I, that these proposals are referred and reported back April 1 as in No. 30-A, as proposed for other sports other than men's basketball and football, to the Council and the Commission so we can deal with them then in a more thoughtful way.

[NOTE: It was determined that the motion could apply only to No. 30, Part G.]

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Over the lunch hour, we were able to obtain the votes, the roll-call vote on No. 30—1, which in context talked about referring Part G to the Council for the further study. Within Division I, Proposal 30—1 secured 58.4 percent of the vote. The victory margin was 191 to 136. The concept of the additional referral passed in Division I-A 65 to 50, lost in Division I-AA 41 to 56, and passed in I-AAA 85 to 30. That is for a total of 191 to 136.

I think the only reason that Proposal No. 30—1 was defeated was

as a result of the voting in Divisions II and III. I think the Division I membership has indicated its interest in the idea of developing a complete proposal related to all sports.

[A motion to refer Proposal No. 30, Part G (Page A-35) to the NCAA Council was approved by Division I, 170-150, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I rise to ask for some information about the amendment under Part G as it relates to once in four years exceptions. As I read this, and please tell me if my interpretation is correct or incorrect, if we have 26 current games we now may also play two additional scrimmages. If this amendment were passed, you would have to ask for an exception to play two scrimmages once in four years, which would give you 26 and 2. But in the three other years, you would be left with having to count those two scrimmages within the 26, which would leave you with 24 games and two scrimmages. Is that a correct interpretation of what would happen if this passed?

President Witte: Yes.

Mr. Marshall: Then I would hope that Division III would vote to reject this.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): If appropriate, I move on behalf of Division II that Paragraph G be referred back to the Council, pending a package dealing with all sports.

[NOTE: The motion was expanded to include Division III.]

[The motion was seconded.]

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Mr. President, I am a member of the Presidents Commission for Division II. Delegates in Division II and Division III took a strong stand in support of No. 30, and I would urge them to reject the motion to refer. I don't think that we necessarily need to follow the lead of Division I on this. Thank you.

JoAnne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in support of referring this for Division II. It seems appropriate to me that while we are trying to figure out how many games we are going to play and although it is not effective until 1992, we will be scheduling in some cases. We are scheduling, Division I is referring and I would like to have everybody refer and everybody think together. Thank you.

Olin B. Sansbury Jr. (University of South Carolina at Spartanburg): Mr. Chair, I thought this morning that the delegates voted very strongly to indicated that we wanted to get started with this process, and I think that is what we decided to do. Certainly, Division II and Division III have supported that all along, and I think it should continue to do that.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): I would hope that in Division III we vote to refer this. Even with the information passed out to the NCAA Council, Part E was not included initially there. We had no prior knowledge that "E" would be included in this particular amendment-to-amendment.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 30, Part G (Page A-35) was

General Business Session _____ 281

defeated by Division II, 70-108, and by Division III, 84-142, roll-call votes.]

[NOTE: Discussion continued on Proposal No. 30—11 for Divisions II and III.]

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): Right now, we have the exemption every year, and what this will do is allow Divisions II to come to Alaska to play basketball games against men and women once in every four years. We have difficulty scheduling, and we think it should remain the same.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): I don't know how many of the Division III institutions participate in the Hall of Fame World Classic or go on a foreign tour or go to Hawaii or Alaska, but I think this proposal would affect a vital part of this program once every four years. That is, having two scrimmages and not having them count. On that basis, I urge you to vote against this amendment. Thank you.

G. Lynn Lashbrook (University of Alaska, Fairbanks): I am director of athletics at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, and for the lower 48 I have been there a year and one-half, minus 16 degrees, oil spill, and now a volcano. We need some help up there. We don't want to exploit the four-year rotation. We would like to get as many different schools to come up for the educational experience. Sometimes motivation gives an exemption game. We would like to think it is an educational experience. We do need some sensitivity for the state of Alaska. It is not easy scheduling up there, believe me. I would like your consideration on that when we go through this amendment. Thank you.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): The Commission considered the problems of Alaska, the NIT and some of the others, and realized there was need for accommodating those concerns. They were legitimate concerns. No. 30—11 is an effort on the part of the Commissions to provide a measure of flexibility while at the same time moving towards the reduction of the pressures on our student-athletes. We think it is a reasonable compromise, and I would urge my colleagues to give it due support. Thank you.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I would like to ask you to support the amendment. It not only supports the needs of our Alaskan and Hawaiian friends, but it also is in keeping with the intent of the Presidents Commission.

Charles J. Gordon (Rhodes College): I would like to encourage members of all three division to vote against No. 30—1. Scrimmages are very important in our programs, and I see no reason not to be able to hold these. My feeling is they were probably included in error in No. 30—11, prohibited once in four years. It is a vital part of our program and very inexpensive, and I urge a "no" vote on No. 30—11.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I think you have to consider, Division III, the amendment and also what would happen in Part G if the amendment is not passed and you pass Part G. The original amendment would take away the scrimmages and

you would be left with 25 games and no scrimmages. The amendment would put back in the scrimmages on a once every four years basis; so as you vote for the amendment, and then Part G, you have to keep those two things in mind. Right now we have two scrimmages and 26 games; and if the amendment is in, we have 25 and 2 scrimmages every four years. If the amendment-to-amendment does not pass, you will be left with 25 and no scrimmages if G is passed.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Commission members, I encourage a "yes" vote on this amendment and encourage you to support it and let us move ahead with the cost-containment measures related to our division and also to think about the athletes that we are helping through this amendment.

[Proposal No. 30—1 (Page A-39) was approved by Division II, 148-30, two abstentions, and defeated by Division III, 117-118, one abstention (and five defective ballots), roll-call votes.]

From the floor: I guess in Division III yesterday some of us must have been asleep, because we really made a mess of this. I move for reconsideration of Part G to refer it to Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

Charles J. Gordon (Rhodes College): It has been explained to me by members of the steering committee and there appears to be some sentiment among those in Division III that we could, in fact, pass Part G and limit ourselves to 25 games, come back and take care of this scrimmage issue next year before the effective date in 1992. We cut it back as we talked about before lunch, have our cake and eat it, too, without referring. We would need to pass G to limit ourselves to 25, prepare appropriate legislation for presentation at next year's Convention that takes care of the oversight of limiting our scrimmages and, in fact, in 1992 have 25 games plus the scrimmages back.

[The motion to reconsider referring Proposal No. 30, Part G (Page A-35) was defeated by Division III, 82-155, roll-call vote.]

[Proposal No. 30, Part G (Page A-35) was approved by Division II (112-55, two abstentions, roll-call vote) as amended by No. 30—11.]

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): To try to cut ourselves out of the corner that we have gotten ourselves into, evidently, I think the majority of the Division III membership is in support of the Presidents Commission's attempts to reduce the number of games.

Somewhere, the scrimmages got mixed in, and I think a lot of Division III members didn't realize that implication. But in an attempt to show support for the presidents and what they are attempting to do, and since the implementation date is 1992—hoping that the steering committee or conferences will come forward with some legislation next year to put back in scrimmages if G is adopted—I think that I would like to recommend that Division III

vote for G which would drop the number of games by one in Division III and would eliminate the two scrimmages, with the idea that they be put back in at a future Convention.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): Mr. President, I wish to endorse in its entirety the comments of our previous speaker, and I believe that we do need to adopt G and in doing so reduce the number of games. I will personally see to it that the Presidents Commission considers dealing with the question of scrimmages in the course of the next year, but I urge us to adopt G and get on with it.

[Proposal No. 30, Part G (Page A-35) was approved by Division III (213-25, roll-call vote) unamended.]

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 30, Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

Now, President Witte, I would like to move the adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30-4.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Witte, I represent the Division I-A athletics directors as chair of that group, and at a meeting in Tucson during the fall, with more than 90 institutions, of 105 represented, we supported a position as reflected by 30-4. I also ran this by the president of the American Football Coaches Association. It is pretty easy for me to do because he works down the hall from me and he likewise thought it was a good compromise.

We want to support the Presidents Commission to a great degree here and we believe that this does it. Three years ago, we had a survey in the Pacific-10 Conference with the student-athletes in football. They overwhelmingly supported the idea of spring practice. As we look at this, cutting the spring practice 21 days, is a reduction in total days of commitment of 42 percent. Also a reduction in the actual practice time from 20 days to 15 days is a 25-percent actual reduction.

We believe that there is too much time spent; and therefore, we support this position very, very much. We think that this is a good compromise and one that will allow us, people who are interested in providing the opportunity for instruction for football players, just the opportunity to do so. We would urge all of Division I-A institutions to support this as well as supporting the Presidents Commission. Thank you, sir.

[Proposal No. 30-4 (Page A-38) was approved by Division I-A, 81-28, one abstention, and Division I-AA, 52-33, three abstentions, roll-call votes.]

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I would like to move to refer Proposal No. 30, Part B to the NCAA Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

Regarding the Presidents Commission members, I would like to say that their heart is in the right place but their expertise, in my opinion, is not. I think it is time to stop our action on No. 30 and let

those who have the expertise and knowledge work out the details. It is better, in my opinion, to take no action than to approve what seems to be serious measures that really do not address the problems in football and basketball.

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to urge defeat of the motion to refer. There were several presidents that were not in the room when an earlier motion to refer Section G was on the floor and several have raised with me questions as to the position of the Presidents Commission on that issue. Let it be made clear personally on behalf of the Presidents Commission members with whom I have talked that we feel that the Convention, and all of us that have worked so long and hard on these proposals, are ready to continue with the consideration and adoption. We, therefore, oppose the motion to refer.

Samuel L. Becker (University of Iowa): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak against referral. Every member of this Association has known for some years that something needs to be done to reduce the time student-athletes devote to their sports. The members have had ample time to study and make proposals to ameliorate this problem. Yet every time a proposal is made, we insist that we need more time for study and that there are better proposals that can be made.

Well, if there are better proposals, I don't understand why those who make such claims, who are pushing for delay, have not laid their proposal before this Convention. I would suggest that until they do so, we move ahead with the proposals that have been made so we can make at least a bit of progress toward protecting students. When someone comes up with a better proposal, we can always substitute them for those that are before us. So, I urge you to reject the motion to refer and to support Proposal 30-B throughout.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): I would just like to urge the Division I-A members to support No. 30-B as it has been amended. It keeps football in the spring as meaningful football, but it is a step toward reform and I think we should support it.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): We heard a few moments ago representations that the Division I athletics directors and the chair of the American Football Coaches Association both support 30-B, as amended. What we are looking for is their expertise. It seems that we have got it. We ought to endorse it and we ought to enact 30-B in I-A and I-AA.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): No. 30-B, as amended, is a prime compromise. It eliminates about 40 percent of the calendar time for the spring practice. We lose 25 percent of practice time for spring practice, and we should move forward. Let's get on with it.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 30, Part B (Page A-33), as amended by Proposal No. 30-4, was defeated by Division I-A, 10-104, and Division I-AA, 4-89, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Dwight D. Vines (Northeast Louisiana University): I voted on

the prevailing side of Division I-A on referral of Proposition No. 30-G, and I would now like to move to reconsider that motion.

[The motion was seconded.]

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Again, Division I twice already today has supported the idea of referral. I just bring up that I guess in reconsidering Part G we are looking at least to five more roll-call votes in Division I, after we get over whether we are going to refer or not. There seems to be some significant sentiment to permit or reintroduce a number of the exemptions that have been exhausted anyway, so we will be back to ground zero for the most part. We have spent now a great amount of time at this. I would urge defeat of consideration of this motion and let's move on to something else.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): I believe it is imperative that we reconsider this item. We have taken a lot of time with it, but it is a signal of great importance beyond this room. The reforms that are proposed, I believe, may not be perfect, but we have worked item after item, year after year, perfecting things.

In reconsidering this, moving it back, I know that the members of the Presidents Commission would work with the coaches' organizations in basketball and in football to refine these proposals. But we have an important statement to make to students, to our university communities and to the public at large that the reform movement is going forward. I urge reconsideration of referral of Item G. It is the most important thing at this Convention. It is the biggest symbol that we will put forward in 1990. Thank you.

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): I join my colleague from the University of New Orleans and as a member of the Presidents Commission I am strongly urging reconsideration of referral of Proposition 30-G. As I mentioned earlier on another proposal, there were several not in the room when that was reconsidered immediately after lunch. We think in fairness to the importance of this issue, it very strongly needs reconsideration.

Gen. Dave R. Palmer (U.S. Military Academy): Mr. Chair, we need to make a mark on the wall. This has been studied, studied and studied; and everyone comes up saying we should wait, we should study it further. We need to start now, even if it is not perfect. Delay is the deadliest form of denial. Let's go on and make a mark on the wall. It doesn't begin until the academic year 1992-93 anyway. There is plenty of time to cross the t's and dot the i's, and we should not delay any longer. Thank you.

Brad W. Hovious (University of Texas, El Paso): I am against the idea of reconsideration basically because of the reasons Doug Dickey alluded to earlier. We come down to a practical matter of financing our programs, giving up basketball games and in my particular program two or three basketball will pay for three or four nonrevenue sports. The basketball games we play in December, we go right up the road to New Mexico State, and most of these are

home games for us. We are looking at big dollars here. They are sorely needed in our program; and not just my program, but others.

If you take this one step further, and you look at football, you say, okay, let's cut one football game. That saves seven days for an athlete in his academic calendar during the fall. But it destroys a heck of a lot of revenue for those people that have to drop that game. I would like for you to consider the economic impact of this because, believe it or not, that is where we have to live as athletics directors. I would ask you to defeat this proposal at this time.

Christine H.B. Grant (University of Iowa): Throughout this Convention we have insisted that we must send the message to student-athletes on academics. We have done so. I think we owe it to the student-athletes to send another message saying that we have heard their concerns on the time demands made on athletics. I urge you to reconsider and to pass the motion. Thank you.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): Mr. Chair, very briefly, this is both a substantive and a symbolic issue. It is substantive because it will reduce the time; but perhaps more importantly, it is symbolic because, ladies and gentlemen, this is the issue and now is the time either to put our house in order or not on the question of time pressure on our student-athletes. I strongly encourage a vote for reconsideration. Thank you.

William L. Cords (Marquette University): It has been clear that in two votes in Division I that this item has been requested for referral. We are being asked to reconsider that again. Now, this legislation is well-meant and it has a very good purpose. But it has not only academic implications, it has financial implications. Its academic implications will have some effect on reducing the time demands on our students, but there are other items and activities that have more demands on those students and their time.

For instance, practice; film sessions; conditioning sessions, and many other activities beyond games put pressure on. Financially, this may have a more negative effect on our students because it will reduce revenues that in turn may reduce programs or parts of programs. I don't believe that is what we are trying to do here. We are trying to do what is very best for the students. If we sought the students' opinions on what the problem was, we ought to seek the students' advice and opinions on what the solution is. I think that if you would ask the students if they would like to play games for practice, you might be surprised at the answer you get with regard to practice. This is good legislation and well-intended. It does not provide the solution that is satisfactorily going to address the problem.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I would like to speak in opposition to reconsideration of referral. I do so on academic grounds. I am concerned that this item, which is before us, is not the correct solution. I am really almost flabbergasted that we think if we take away three games from these kids and move back the start of practice, which is in this, and move back

the start of play that we are going to solve the problem. That is not where the problem is coming from.

That is the problem I see with this legislation. It is not attacking the root problem. I totally am in favor of removing the root problem and I greatly support the Presidents Commission's effort to do that. I think what we need to do, though, is to think about how to get down to the root problem. If you want to know my answer and how to get down to the root problem, it comes from the pressures generated by national television in men's basketball. I don't hear anybody saying we want to give up a \$1 billion television contract that we just signed. We don't want to do that. That is what is creating the pressure.

So what we need to do is to get to the bottom of it, find out how we can deal with all of the questions—out-of-season time spent by these kids and in-season time—and then come back with a recommendation. Maybe part of that recommendation will be reducing some games. If it is so, put it in context, and I would strongly support it. At this point, I think this is not the correct solution to a problem that we all agree is there.

William E. Davis (Louisiana State University): Mr. President, I speak against reconsideration. While I agree it is important to send out messages, I think that this is the wrong message if we allow this piece of legislation. It should not be considered.

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): What I am proposing here might be a way out; but my chancellor, Chancellor O'Brien, is on the Presidents Commission. I do disagreement with him concerning this proposal.

However, in light of what is happening here today—we have been spending all of this time—might it not be possible that if we could get the Presidents Commission to agree that if we pass this proposal, which is not going into effect until 1992, that we could get the Tom Osbornes, the Joe Paternos, that we could get the National Basketball Coaches Association to meet with them between now and next year and come up with the things that we as athletics directors, presidents and faculty representatives would like to see. Maybe, we could all win and we could go home tonight.

[The motion to reconsider referral of Proposal No. 30, Part G, (Page A-35) by Division to the Council was approved, 165-156, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

[NOTE: Referral of Proposal No. 30, Part G, was discussed later in the meeting but is included here for ease of reference.]

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): For the same reasons urged in asking for reconsideration, I would very strongly ask the body to vote against referring Section G to the Council and to keep it on the table as it was initially introduced for consideration.

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): As we stated previously, could we get Mr. Coor and the Presidents Commission to agree that if we pass this that they would meet with our various organizations so when we come back next year we could have a very

workable, agreeable piece of legislation that we could all live with? Could we get that assurance?

Mr. Coor: Mr. Chair, to the extent I understand the question about what is to be brought back on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I strongly support here, as we have in the past, a desire to work with all of the existing groups within the NCAA and all of those that currently exist and are represented. We have sought to do that as we brought this proposal forward. With its adoption today, we would actively continue that consultation as refinements take place for implementation. I want to make sure I do understand the question. We are urging action today for its adoption, and we certainly will actively consult as the implementation takes place. We don't support the delaying of the proposal itself.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 30, Part G (Page A-35) was defeated, 147-177, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal 30, Part D for Division II.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move the adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—6.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, what No. 30—6 does is simply correct a typographical error and is supported by the Presidents Commission. It changes October 15th back to October 1st, which was the original intent for Division II.

From the Floor: On the amount of time that you are giving the Division II basketball athletes, we passed No. 30-G and picked up six to nine hours of "study time" by cancelling three basketball games. We did not change the date when you could commence competition. We still are open the third weekend before Thanksgiving. Now, you move conditionally to October 1st and you think that you are going to put a ball in their hands November 1st. What do you think those coaches are going to be doing October 1st? They get an extra two weeks in the gym.

Now, we can go in the gym for conditioning on October 1st. That is 30 days. What kind of practice time are you relieving students of if you allow that conditioning in the gym, still allow the opening competition date the weekend before Thanksgiving and pick up six to nine hours by cancelling three basketball games, which may be things they enjoy doing the most. I urge you not to pass this and allow conditioning to go inside the gym October 1st. All you have done is take a basketball out of their hands.

[Proposal No. 30—6 (Page A-39) was approved by Division II, 156-16, roll-call vote.]

[Proposal No. 30, Part D (Page A-34) was approved by Division II (153-20) as amended by No. 30—6, roll-call vote.]

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to urge the Convention to adopt Amendment-to-Amendment No. 30—11 to Part G. As I mentioned when this matter first came to the

floor earlier today, much earlier today, on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council the intent of this is to retain the central principles of the basketball season as defined in Part G but to allow once every four years for a team to participate in the series of exempted activities already in the NCAA legislation. That would include the Alaska, Hawaii, NIT and other identified contests. We believe this strengthens the proposal and, therefore, strongly urge the adoption of No. 30—11 as a prelude to our recommendations to adopt Part G.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): As one of the sponsors of this amendment-to-amendment, we would like to concur with the Presidents Commission and urge your support of this amendment. It is an accommodation so that we can keep the exemptions alive and take care of organizations and institutions that have been very, very important in the development of intercollegiate basketball. We urge all members to support this amendment, and I second the motion.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I realize that to oppose the Presidents Commission today is somewhat like opposing motherhood, but I would like to state that one of the reasons for those of us who supported referral was that we do not believe that this is a good solution. What we are doing is opening a Pandora's box for an unlimited number of exemptions. We will once every four years say that it is all right for a student to play 29 or 30 games even though we are told that that is not the direction we should be going.

I strongly urge, even if we pass everything here today, that we turn our backs on this direction and once and for all decide what the number of basketball games are correct for us to play. If that is 26, let's pass 26. If it is 27, let's pass 27. If it is 25, let's pass 25. At that point, there are no exemptions. That gives every member institution in this room the right to decide how they schedule their basketball games. If you make money, play those games at home and keep your budget. If you want to go some place else to play those games, you declare that on an institutional basis.

That is the only practical way to address solid reform in the area of basketball scheduling. We need to set that number. We have not done that in an appropriate way. Even if we go back to 25, we should not approach this because next year we will be told that because the Eastern European situation has improved we should add two games with the Russians. And we will continually do this through the years; we are addressing the wrong issue. We ought to address the single number of games and move in that direction. I urge your defeat of this proposal.

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): Mr. Chair, I support the comments made by Mr. Kramer, my colleague, in responding to President Coor's statements regarding the effects of 30-11. It seems to me it does not strengthen the original motion. It is certainly controversial, although he referred to earlier that it would be noncontroversial.

I find it inconsistent with what we are talking about today as it relates to time demands. Part of the proposed change would allow the institutions to send their athletes to areas outside the mainland and miss a week of classes.

Are we saying that from a time-demand standpoint it is all right once every four years to miss a week of classes, but we are going to cut back three games a year, which may or may not cause us to reduce classes and reduce the time demands? I do not see any consistency in this amendment as it relates to the original amendment. Personally, I think No. 30—8 has a lot more merit if we are going to change the original amendment.

The other part of it that concerns me, as we talked about before, is the cost implications related to reducing the number of games, which is not a part of this amendment, but when you tie that in, the inconsistency of this legislation, of this proposal. If you have ever used that exemption and attended those games, it certainly is a very costly effort to go to either Hawaii or Alaska and participate.

Douglas A. Dickey (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Earlier today, I spoke on an issue referred to as having confused apples and oranges. Being at the University of Tennessee, I want you to know I am speaking of oranges at this point. It is important to look at some matters from the financial side. I am the chair of the cost-containment committee of the active Division I-A members. We are dealing with issues of cost containment. When you start dealing with cutting down significant numbers of basketball games, you are talking about significant dollars. The Presidents Commission has made a very strong statement today that we need to deal with the athlete. It is a little bit of a question of who gets the credit before the day is over.

I think all of us would like to give the Presidents Commission some strong voice. Yes, you have sent us a message about the athlete, but you missed just a little bit on spring practice, and you agreed to it and the membership agreed to it. You have missed a little bit on the basketball game. Another proposal is in here about 28 games, and so forth. We are not quite right on the number, yet. I am suggesting that we let this go, and let's get a fixed number and try to live with it. There is an amendment for 28 games without any exemptions. We would like to see that happen. That is what Division I-A athletics directors supported.

Stanley B. Sheriff (University of Hawaii): I want to take just a few seconds to say that the University of Hawaii reluctantly supports the Presidents Commission. I realize that Roy Kramer in Nashville, Tennessee, has institutions within a radius of 100 miles where he could play his 25 or 28 basketball games. The University of Hawaii is the only full-fledged Division I-A member outside of the continental United States. We are 2,600 miles from the mainland. We are not just talking about our basketball team, but our golf team, our women's tennis team, our volleyball team. We have to seek out competition. We must travel 2,600 miles before we hit land. It would be like asking Roy Kramer to play in the Pac-10 and fly all the way over there before

he gets any competition.

One of the things that has made the University of Hawaii a viable Division I member has been the exemption. If you reduce it to 25 games and keep the exemption or if you say no exemptions and 28 games, we are not going to be able to get the Division I schedule. I would ask you to recognize that.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I would just like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 30—11. I have had three institutions on the East Coast playing Hawaii this year without missing one day of class. I would like to bring to your attention that it doesn't automatically mean that they missed class time. Also, just a point of clarification: On the present NIT tournament, the teams can play anywhere from one to four games, depending on their success. I just wonder how, if this is not adopted, teams that are invited to that prestigious event would begin to prepare their schedules not knowing whether they have to count one or four games?

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): I also have the honor of being the president of the Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association, the sponsor of the NIT. I think I speak for all of those who hold exemptions at this time. The exemptions were given for very solid reasons. Some were geographical, as we have just heard from the University of Hawaii. Some were because of long service and tradition; and some for other reasons, such as international relations with the foreign teams coming here and our teams going there. We must give these types of organizations some consideration. I urge you to support this amendment-to-amendment so that these people will not be put out of existence.

[Proposal No. 30—11 (Page A-39) was approved by Division I, 223-97, four abstentions, roll-call vote.]

William L. Cords (Marquette University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 30—7. Because of the last vote, we have already made exemptions to No. 30-G. We have no quarrel with the exemptions as they have been approved; but at the same time, one or more of those exemptions may provide more lost class time in one year as an exemption than you may have over four years with the loss of three games. No. 30—7 allows for 28 regular-season games as they are. No. 30-G and its purpose is very good. It will not solve the problem satisfactorily with time demands being eased for student-athletes. It may have financial implications that will be damaging to the student-athletes and provide for a loss of opportunity for those who may be in school at the time it is implemented or those who may want to come to school and will not have the opportunity to do so. On that basis, I move approval.

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): I would like to second that motion and report that at our Tucson meeting of the Division I-A athletics directors, the concept in No. 30—7 was supported by the majority of those in attendance.

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I would like to urge opposition to No.

30—7. It calls basically for the status quo of 28 games, and the evidence we have examined suggests that the current number of 28 unchanged has led many institutions, in fact, the average to have 34 contests. We urge strongly the defeat of No. 30—7.

Douglas Kahn (University of Michigan): I would just like a point of order or a ruling. Maybe I don't understand this proposal, but it appears to me that this proposal is simply going back to what is currently in the rules. I would think that it is improper to create an amendment-to-amendment that just goes back to the same rule. You just have to vote down the proposal that is there, not amend it in this way.

President Witt: The difference is that the exemptions are in the current rule. This does not have any exemptions.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): In regard to the two speakers who commented about the 34-game season, the 34-game season came about because of the exemptions that have already been passed by a majority of over 100 votes. There is not any way that you can get 26 games in a regular season to equal 34. Any Division I institution in the mid and lower range, that votes to reduce to 25 games is cutting its own throat. I urge support of the amendment to keep it at 28 games.

[Proposal No. 30—7 (Page A-39) was defeated by Division I, 152-168, roll-call vote.]

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I would just like to point out what we are giving the appearance of doing here. We are voting for 25 games, which looks real good in PR, to say we are cutting back the number of contests. Then a moment ago, we passed all these exemptions. I really wonder if we are not being inadvertently hypocritical in what we are doing. I think we are working at cross purposes, and this is part of what I said before.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Mr. Chair, I urge that we vote in favor of this proposal. There has been an accommodation through No. 30—11 to allow once every four years the exemptions that had been previously approved. What is really before us now is the sending of a signal. The Presidents Commission has agreed to work with the coaches organizations to bring about those refinements that we need to make this workable. We have next year's Convention to make refinements as we have on Prop 42 and as we have on Prop 48. It is an important step. Ladies and gentlemen, I urge your support, please, for this very, very important item.

[Proposal 30, Part G (Page A-35) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 30—11, 206-116, roll-call vote.]

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposals Nos. 30-C, E and F. These three proposals together, as set forward and as I described at the outset, are the beginning times for conditioning, practice and the first game of the season.

[The motion was seconded.]

As part of the entire package developed by the Presidents Commis-

sion, we urge support of Propositions 30-C, E and F. They stipulate that conditioning can begin on October 1st, practice can begin on November 1st and the start of the season is set for December 1st. We believe this is an integral part of the entire proposal.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): Mr. President, I would like to move that we refer C and E for Division I to the NCAA Council.

I am concerned not with the principles behind this, which I support, but with the details. In this particular case, I think that the intent is to reduce the number of practice days and apparently to have the playing season adjusted accordingly to the number of practice days that are reduced. However, by setting dates for starting practice rather than limiting the number of practice days and setting a specific day for changing the specific date for the start of the season—rather than just limiting the number of games, which seems to be the most appropriate thing to do—they have put an unreasonable boundary on institutions like ours as to when we can play our games.

December 1 almost always is hard for a quarter-system school. Our fall quarter ends finally about December 15th. That is the end of the final exams. So, in our case and the other quarter schools like ours, we start about the 1st of December and we have final exams the second week in December. So, we effectively can't even begin thinking about scheduling games until the middle of December, followed by Christmas, New Year's, et cetera. A total number of practice days and hours and total number of games would seem to solve the problem rather than specific dates. I don't think it is appropriate legislation.

I would like to see this referred to the Council for appropriate consideration so that we can come back and deal with it at a later date when these concerns are addressed.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): The debate in the Division III business session was one of concern as to the appropriateness of passing Section F. I hesitate to pronounce a definitive statement prior to a final vote for fear of duplicating the Dewey-Truman defeat headlines. However, it did appear that the overriding sentiment was that a starting date of December 1 would prove deleterious to the student-athletes' classroom schedule. December 1 places unrealistic demands on second-semester scheduling.

Most universities will conduct fall examinations the second week of December with potential reading days in the first week of December. With our students involved in final examinations, and consequently a return home for semester break, they may not resume classes until the third week of January. Please keep in mind that in the absence of athletics grants-in-aids to our students, these students will of necessity seek employment to finance their education and not return to campus for the appropriate reason.

If they, in fact, do return early to campus, a dollar cost will accrue to the institution, as well as responsibility for the student throughout the 22 nonpractice hours when we know classes are not in session and when there is the absence of other large campus activities. When

games do resume, the competition will be such that three, possibly a four-contest-per-week schedule, might occur in order to fill commitments. We have said "yes" to 25 games in Division III and we will say "yes" to a November 1st starting line, and we are saying "yes" to our students. Please say "yes" to our students relative to class time scheduled by saying "no" to Section F in Division III.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): We considered alternative legislation that would involve counting the number of weeks backward from the start of the NCAA men's basketball tournament and the women's basketball tournament. If you count back 13 weeks and figure that you are going to play on an average two games a week for a 26-game schedule as an example, you would get back to about December 15th in every one of the next five years. There really is time in the schedule, including dead week and exam periods, for the fall quarter or fall semester to play the 25-game schedule between December 1st and the start of the tournament. I urge the Convention not to refer.

[The motion to refer Proposals Nos. 30, Part C and 30, Part E (Page A-33) for Division I was defeated, 107-218, roll-call vote.]

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Mr. President, I would move the adoption of Proposal No. 30, Part C for Division III.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 30, Part C (Page A-33) was approved by Division III, 206-24, roll-call vote.]

[Proposals Nos. 30, Part C and 30, Part E (Page A-33) were approved by Division I, 255-63, roll-call vote.]

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): Mr. Chair, I strongly urge the members of Division III to defeat No. 30-F. With the defeat of this, we will have a November 1 starting date with 25 contests and our first contest will start as it does now on a Friday immediately preceding Thanksgiving. I would urge your support of the defeat of that.

[Proposal No. 30, Part F (Page A-35) was defeated by Division III, 11-129, roll-call vote.]

Reconsideration of Spring Practice—Division II Football (31)

Harry L. Forsythe (South Dakota State University): I would like to move to reconsider Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a Division II football issue. However, as chair of the Division II Football Committee this is an item that is very, very important to me. We have done a lot of work to get Division II football where it is today, and we feel that we have a fine, fine national championship. We have the Harlan Gill Award now, which is becoming a very prestigious award, that is given with this football championship.

We feel that the action that we took on No. 31 today was premature, because of what has been done and happened this afternoon. We feel that we should back up and take a look at what we have done and probably get in line with where the rest of the member-

ship is today. I think that it is only fair to tell you that the Division II Football Committee has encouraged Division II football teams to increase their schedule, to strengthen their schedule. Strengthening the schedule is a very, very subjective thing, but it is also very, very important to Division II football. It is very, very hard for us to encourage our coaches in Division II to go up and play a game or two with Division I-AA schools if they do not have the same football restrictions. I guess I would like to say that we think the spring football schedule that has been passed and reduced in Division I and I-A is where we should be. So I urge reconsideration of Amendment No. 31.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Mr. President, I am vice-president of the Division II Steering Committee. On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and the Council, I would like to urge your defeat of this reconsideration. We feel, those on the steering committee, that Proposal 31 properly places the Division II football where it should be and provides us with 12 opportunities for our student-athletes in the spring. I don't believe any of us do any scheduling with I-AA schools in the spring.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): I rise to speak against reconsideration of this motion. I ask the members of Division II to realize that we have been working hard to take a look at our football program. Certainly, the elimination of contact during the spring session does not do anything injurious at all to our championships or the scope of our programming in the fall. I also ask that the Division II membership consider the fact that as a result of the spring football there has been a serious increase in injuries to our athletes and reducing the contact during the spring would certainly help them have a better fall season. I urge you to defeat this motion for reconsideration.

William M. Leete Jr. (University of New Haven): I would like to speak in support of reconsideration. I can understand the drive for reduction in the number of days and I support that. But contact is an inherent part of football. I don't see the relationship between time reduction and a spring contact drill. We are taking away the ability to coach our athletes in football, other than the quarterbacks and wide receivers perhaps who can throw the ball around. I am not sure that football coaches would know what to do with defensive linemen and offensive linemen without having a pad involved. I believe that it is not good legislation the way it is, and I believe that No. 30-4 is a far better compromise. I urge my Division II fellow members to support reconsideration.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, representing the Division II presidents on the Presidents Commission, we urge that you vote "no" on reconsideration. We do indeed support the NCAA Division II Steering Committee's rationale. We think that 12 sessions are appropriate, and this position puts Division II football where we need it.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 31 (Page A-42) was

defeated, 41-75, roll-call vote.]

Reconsideration of Playing and Practice Seasons (30)

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, in light of your ruling that if Proposition 30, as amended and adopted, can be reconsidered only once and in light of the experiences in years past where reconsideration on subsequent days when not all members who had initially been present still were, I move for reconsideration of Proposition No. 30, as amended.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to reconsider proposal No. 30 (Page A-32) as amended was defeated in all divisions (102-217, three abstentions, in Division I; 19-154 in Division II; 9-125 in Division III) roll-call votes.]

John J. Crouthamel (Syracuse University): Mr. President, there is a significant number of Division I members, both I-A and I-AA, who have a concern that we have eliminated some formal method of addressing the reduction of time spent by student-athletes in the various sports. As a result of the defeat of No. 30-1 and the opportunities to refer No. 30-G, the Presidents Commission has suggested that they will now go to the various sports groups. Is there some sort of formal way that the Convention can be assured of the process which will, in fact, address the issues and we can address that formal legislative proposal at next year's Convention?

Lattie F. Coor (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, may I again reaffirm strongly the conviction of the Presidents Commission that the Commission wishes to work with all of the established groups, and look forward to that meeting.

A. Don Drennan (Abilene Christian University): As a registered Democrat, I would like to commend the chair and the parliamentarian for a great job in directing us through some very difficult circumstances. (Applause)

President Witte: I would like to say that I consider myself essentially a puppet, and I don't mind my string or strings pulled by the likes of Alan Chaplain

[The Division I business session was recessed at 5:10 p.m.]

Wednesday Morning, January 10, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m., with President Witte presiding.

President Witte: Will the delegates please take your seats. The general business session scheduled for this morning is now in session. May I remind the delegates that previously we had reordered Proposals 32 and 33.

Financial Aid—Summer School

Bill M. Seay (Louisiana State University): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit us to bring freshmen in for summer

school. It provides that those freshmen would become counters and that their financial support for summer would be in proportion to the financial support for the succeeding fall. It would give these young people an opportunity to begin their college career without the pressures of practice and without the typical confusion of the fall semester. I strongly urge us to pass this legislation.

Bernard F. Sliger (Florida State University): I remind the delegates that the Presidents Commission is sponsoring Proposition No. 32. I think that the intent of No. 33 is good, but the way it would be handled, we think, would be better under No. 32 than No. 33.

[Proposal No. 33 (Page A-44) was defeated, 201-438, eight abstentions, roll-call vote, after being moved ahead of No. 32.]

Financial Aid—Summer School

Bernard F. Sliger (Florida State University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move adoption of Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to permit financial aid for prospective student-athletes to attend the summer institution, summer terms, summer orientations. In sponsoring this proposal, the Commission took the position that the student-athlete ought to be given every opportunity to be acclimated to the environment as soon as possible.

The Commission is mindful, however, that this proposal gives rise to two concerns that student-athletes may be provided financial aid under the terms of this legislation in order to conduct practice prior to the beginning of the school year. To guard against such abuse, the legislation contains specific prohibitions against recipients participating in athletics practice activities as set forth in Bylaw 17 for the use of institutional weight-training facilities in any sport in which the student-athlete has been recruited.

Further, to emphasize that the decision to provide financial assistance is an institutional decision, the proposal contains an additional provision that the student's financial aid must be granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. This proposal carries an immediate effective date, and in behalf of the Commission I urge your vote for this proposed legislation.

Jim Livengood (Washington State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move Amendment-to-Amendment No. 31—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

You will notice two changes in the amendment-to-amendment. The first is we ask that only organized athletics practice be prohibited during the summer. Second, prohibiting the use of any institutional waiver is unrealistic. That athletes cannot work out on campus and denying them the use of any institutional weight room is going to drive them right into some private facility off our campuses.

We are all interested in giving our athletes this chance in getting ahead in the classroom; but at the same time, let's let them con-

tinue to condition. We ask your support of 32—1.

Chris Voelz (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Should No. 32 pass, I need a point of clarification. The student-athlete leaves after the summer: One, will that person be counted in the graduation rate; and, two, will that person, he or she, be a countable that subsequent academic year?

President Witte: There is no answer to your first question with regard to the relationship between this proposal and graduation rates. There is simply no answer at this time to your first question. With regard to your second question, there is no provision in the proposal with accountability under the circumstances that you have summarized.

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): I just want the record to show that in No. 32—1, the word "organized" should be underlined as being added.

[Proposal No. 32—1 (Page A-44) was approved, 501-165, 10 abstentions, roll-call.]

Bernard F. Sliger (Florida State University): The Presidents Commission cheerfully accepts the amendment and we hope that you will pass the proposal.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, this is an amendment that is hard to argue against. It has a lot of good features to it. It is hard to argue against it because of the academics. I would like to point out the other side of the coin as I view some of the problems with it. First of all, if you allow student-athletes to come to summer school, you are going to have to have somebody in charge of the summer job programs. I would vision that somebody on the staff is going to be assigned to secure about 40 summer jobs on campus.

Secondly, nothing can be an organized practice. I envision captains' practices, where captains are told what to do with the squad. I think we are going to have full-scale practices not run by the coaching staff but by the captains. Thirdly, on the financial side of it, we are going to have a lot of financial aid officers who are going to be approached as good friends. There will be extreme pressure, in my judgment, on financial aid officers to develop the best package of aid possible, probably with more grant money than work study loans.

Fourthly, if we are going to compete, and we are in a competitive business, each institution is going to have to do this whether it wants to or not.

Lastly, we have been trying to cut down the time demand on the student-athlete. When you add all this together, if the student is not going to have the opportunity for a full-time summer job, we are going to put increased pressure on campus jobs; and whether you want year-round practice or not—you can call it captain practices or whatever you want—that is what we are going to have.

So, when you weigh them up, the pluses and minuses, from my viewpoint, I don't think this is good legislation. So, I urge you to

defeat this proposal.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Virtually any of the proposals we adopt are subject to abuses and present some problems. The Commission considered some of the points that Commissioner Jacoby raised. We felt in balance that the benefits to our student-athletes far outweighed the possible disadvantages, and I would join Bernard Sliger in urging your support of the proposal.

Diane Milutinovich (California State University, Fresno): I have a question. If a student were a walk-on and were to come to an institution and get this aid, and then go to another institution, would he be considered a transfer student or a first-time entering freshman?

President Witte: If they are a true walk-on, that is, they have never been identified as a student-athlete, never have practiced, then they will not become a recruited athlete.

[Proposal No. 32, Part A (Page A-43) was approved as amended by No. 32—1, 464-220, nine abstentions, roll-call vote. Part B approved by Division I (258-47, three abstentions) and Division II (147-17), roll-call votes.]

Satisfactory-Progress Exceptions

John D. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): For the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would simply change the midterm, midyear enrollment and nonrecruited, not-participant waivers for the satisfactory-progress legislation, to exemptions. In other words, these would be administered by all member institutions as opposed to the conference or the Eligibility Committee. The Academic Requirements Committee believes it would be more logical for member institutions to administer these three waivers as exemptions. I urge adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-49) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Financial Aid-Course Supplies

Richard G. Hiskey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I wish to move Amendment-to-Amendment No. 41—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is entirely consistent with the intent of the overall proposal, which we very much support. The purpose is simply to draw a distinction between two types of supplies that may be involved in courses that our student-athletes take. There are those are of the consumable nature—such as drawing paper, normal art supplies and things like that, which we believe ought to be provisable—and there are other nonconsumable supplies involved in the

courses—cameras or computers, for example—which could be on an issued basis under the amendment-to-amendment.

Richard G. Hiskey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): We support the amendment and believe it is a helpful addition to the legislation.

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): Amendment-to-Amendment No. 41—2 is far preferable to this amendment, and I must speak in opposition to No. 41—1. I support the concept of including the category of books and supplies, as a common element in financial aid expense budgets. This amendment, however, will create unnecessary monetary effects. Why worry about what is consumable and what is not? Is a \$4.95 calculator consumable or not? The Interpretations Committee will be working for years finding acceptable supplies, and then you will all end up in a nightmare with these violations. Vote "no" on No. 41—1 and vote "yes" on No. 41—2, which provides a dollar limitation.

[Proposal No. 41—1 (Page A-52) was defeated, 181-431.]

Ralph McFillen (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Metro Conference, I move Amendment-to-Amendment No. 41—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

We strongly support Proposal No. 41—2 and offer this amendment to provide a \$150 limitation, and we feel this will be good legislation and in the best interest of the student-athlete at the member institutions.

[Proposal No. 41—2 (Page A-53) was approved.]

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal even though many of us who are concerned voted to put in the restrictions if it should pass. We have a cost-reduction committee, and we are all worried about cost reduction. Now, we are saying we can give supplies at \$150 each to every athlete that we have. I would like us to think about this and let the cost-reduction committee have this as one of its concerns. I urge you to vote in opposition to No. 41, as amended.

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-51) was defeated as amended by No. 41—2, 389-235, two-thirds majority required.]

Summer School Financial Aid

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

Two Council proposals at this Convention, the other being No. 60, continue the trend toward greater federation in our legislation. We have seen this trend develop gradually ever since the three divisions were created in 1973, and the trend has gained momentum in recent years. Proposal No. 42 does not change any current rule. It simply moves from dominant legislation to federated legislation our summer financial aid legislation. In the future, any of the divisions or subdivisions could amend this legislation for that

division or subdivision by a simple majority vote, whereas now it takes a two-thirds vote of the entire Convention to change the summer-aid provisions that we have just seen. Again, let me emphasize that we are not changing the summer financial aid legislation with this amendment. We are simply making it possible for the divisions to act separately in that area in the future. On behalf of the Council, I urge your approval of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-58) was approved, 432-206.]

Financial Aid—Summer School

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): On behalf of the presenters, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 43

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of Proposition 43 is to address a very serious loophole in our present financial aid system, which I think has been utilized by certain people in an improper way. We want to put everybody on the same basis. The intent of this is to issue summer school aid for the summer aid issued the previous semester. The practice has been determined that there are instances where full scholarships have been awarded in the summer.

These scholarships do not count under the present system, and thereby, it is a way to expand the scholarship of an athlete without it being countable during the year by an individual who, for instance in a sport that is not a head-count sport, gets a room-and-board scholarship in the year and gets a full scholarship in the summer. By doing this, the scholarships are extended, particularly in those sports with limited number of scholarships. This was not the intent of the limitation of the scholarship rule. It is the intent of Proposition 43 to address that.

The presenters would like to withdraw B. We believe it is not needed unless we are told by the chair that it is. We think that confuses the issue. We would like to withdraw the B section of this. That was not in our original and it has been added, and somebody interpreted what needed to be in the Manual. You don't have to count it, but it has to be awarded in proportion. We felt that the counting would cause severe problems, but the issue is that it be awarded in proportion so that if the individual has a room-and-board scholarship in the regular year, that is the maximum scholarship he could get in the summertime.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): I would like to speak against the adoption of No. 43. There is no question that our summer school financial aid rules can be abused, but there is no contest when you weigh the potential for abuse against our ability to help scholarship and nonscholarship athletes academically. If we are in the business of trying to increase academics, support these young people, it should not be only to those students who are fortunate enough to receive athletics aid.

Mr. Kramer: Mr. Chair, if that is the philosophy, then we should not have limits on the numbers of scholarships we have in baseball, track and field, swimming, and all the other sports where we give

equivalency scholarships. If limits are limits, then they are limits. And we should enforce those limits so everybody is playing on the same field.

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I just want the delegates to be careful and look at the word "proportional." That is the only concern I have. I understand Mr. Kramer's intent for the legislation. But be very careful with the word "proportional," because you will be tying your hands with regard to grants-in-aid that you may want to give to particular students when you are tying it to the rate or proportion that you gave them in the previous year. That works well in institutions that have full grants-in-aid for most of their students. It does not work well at most of the rest of our institutions. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 43 Part A (Page A-54) was approved by Divisions I and II; Part B withdrawn.]

Employment Earnings—Exhausted Eligibility

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last year we extended the term-time earnings from full grant-in-aid limitation for a former student-athlete in this situation. Therefore, we ask for a technical legislative correction in our proposal from last year. This change would remove the cost of attendance. Last year we agreed in principle that it is not appropriate for NCAA legislation to prevent individuals who have completed their eligibility from the previous year and no longer are playing or competing from gaining valuable career experience or supporting their family. We should be assisting our student-athletes in this transaction from athletics and not hindering them.

The problem is that last year's action allows a combined value of financial aid and term-time employment to go only up to the cost of attendance for such student-athlete. That significantly assisted partial-scholarship individuals, but it allows only a very limited amount of employment earnings for basketball and football athletes receiving the full grants-in-aid.

Please note there are many safeguards in place for abuses, even with the removal of the cost-of-attendance cap. These safeguards include all formal employment legislation currently in effect. For instance, the work must be performed and payments made. Cash gifts for previous athletics performance are prohibited. We urge you to finish the job that we started last year and pass Proposition No. 47.

[Proposal No. 47 (Page A-56) was approved.]

Financial Aid—Equivalency Computation

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I would like to urge you to support this proposal, which is intended to confirm that member institutions

may use either full costs or average costs of education in calculating the equivalency value of financial aid provided a student-athlete for purposes of compiling the NCAA squad list. Because of the variety of living arrangements, meal plans and, at institutions where tuition is based on hours of enrollment, course load available to the student-athletes on many campuses, the calculation of equivalency based on actual cost becomes an unduly burdensome responsibility.

In fact, these differences may cause the administrators who otherwise would be inclined to use the NCAA squad list to reject it as unmanageable. The calculation of equivalencies based on average cost in such cases is a much more reasonable alternative. Keep in mind that where these exist, differences in tuition for in-state and out-of-state students would continue to be treated in accordance with an individual's actual status. It should also be noted that the flexibility inherent in this proposal is intended to reflect actual practice in place throughout the membership.

In formal polls conducted at last year's NCAA compliance seminars and further research conducted at the Council's request confirmed that the use of actual and average costs in computing equivalencies is split roughly evenly throughout the membership.

Finally, the research conducted on behalf of the Council would suggest the differences between equivalency awards calculated using average and actual costs to be so small as to be insignificant. The legislation carries an immediate effective date, and I urge your support of this proposal.

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I withdraw my amendment-to-amendment, understanding that Mr. Snell would clarify that this averaging would be for room and board only and not for tuition and fees. My concern is that if we average tuition and fees and potentially for in-state and out-of-state differences at public universities, it could make a significant distinction in equivalency calculations. With that clarification, I would then support the proposition.

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-56) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Individual Eligibility—Use of Banned Drugs

Edward S. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, with your indulgence I will address not only Proposal No. 52 but Proposal No. 54 as well, since they are both very much a part of our past and present discussion on drug testing and sanctions.

First, a brief historical resume is in order. At the 1986 Convention, we adopted for the first time in the Association's history a mandatory drug-testing program for NCAA championships and postseason football bowl competitions. That was not done lightly. We all had doubts and reservations. We disagreed for a variety of

reasons. Any reasonable people disagree reasonably. Individual and conference votes were cast.

We have debated the drug-testing issue and the equal importance of sanctions along these same lines ever since. I will not recount those arguments. Suffice it to say, the Executive Committee requested in San Diego in 1987 that existing sanctions, especially those directed at the entire teams, were not acceptable to the membership at large. In a word, it was recognized that a positive drug test, a violation of a rule of eligibility, was qualitatively different than violations of rules of the eligibility related to academic performance and amateurism.

The Executive Committee suspended those regulations relating to team sanctions, which would have resulted in the event an individual tested positive, until the end of this current academic year, 1989-90. That deadline is fast upon us. It was the intent in the charge of the Executive Committee to present to you, the members, at this Convention, a more definitive recommendation and a clear-cut choice of this complex subject. This has been done.

Through the hard work and cooperation of a large number of people, you now have before you three choices pertaining to sanctions that will result from a positive drug test. The choices are relatively simple. It is the choosing that may be difficult. But choose, we must.

If you vote down both Proposals 52 and 54, we will restore the 1986 status report and sanctions for a positive drug test by an individual athlete and that could result in eventually the same consequences as would a violation of rules of amateurism and academic eligibility. The Executive Committee and the drug-testing subcommittee of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, does not recommend such a course of action.

The second choice would be to say "yes" to Proposal No. 52, which would change the consequences to the individual student that tests positive. Currently, if an athlete tests positive, the result is a very limited 90-day suspension of that individual following the test at the postseason championship or postseason bowl, which actually could be prior to the bowl.

The third choice was to say "yes" or "no" to Proposal No. 54, which would make permanent the Executive Committee's suspension of team sanctions in regard to a positive test by an individual athlete.

Your choices are clear. The Executive Committee and the drug-testing subcommittee strongly recommend the adoption of both Proposals 52 and 54. We have labored long and hard to present the membership with what we believe to be a reasonable fair choice of proposals. We have sought the views of lawyers, testing experts, conference commissioners, individual athletics directors. We might expect those views to still differ, but we believe that Proposals 52 and 54 recommend a consensus. Taken together, they don't impose team or conference sanctions except for wilful violations by institutional personnel, in which case it may be in infrac-

tions matter.

Proposal 52 does stiffen significantly the penalty for the individual athlete who through his or her own will or through the disease of addiction, or otherwise, introduces a banned drug in their body. The penalty will be essentially one year's suspension from competition. That will result only in the event of a positive test under the technical protocol of the NCAA drug-testing procedures. Our reasoning and conclusions are very obvious. Institutions, including the NCAA, can and must have a significant responsibility for educating young men and women about the dangerous consequences of the use of chemicals. We must also do as much as we can within reasonable and legal limits to deter the use of chemicals.

The bottom line, however, is a use of chemicals by individual choice. It is an individual's primary responsibility. We, therefore, feel that the deterrent must be persuasive. For this reason, ladies and gentlemen, we strongly urge the adoption of Proposals Nos. 52 and 54. Thank you, Mr. President.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-59) was approved by all divisions, 292-17, seven abstentions, in Division I; 164-2 in Division II; 203-4 in Division III, all roll-call votes.]

Postseason Eligibility—Use of Banned Drugs

Edward S. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, on behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-61) was approved, 658-20, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Year-Round Drug Testing

Edward S. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this has the full support of the Executive Committee and the drug-testing subcommittee of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. This legislation authorizes the Executive Committee to establish a year-round, NCAA-administered drug-testing program and would discontinue the Association's current limit and voluntary off-season drug-testing program in the sport of football in Division I.

If so authorized, the Executive Committee would limit the year-round testing program to Division I football for a two-year period. It would also limit the test to examination of the performance-enhancing drugs, commonly referred to as anabolic steroids, diuretics and other chemicals that can be used as a masking agent for steroids.

The chemical in this sport was chosen because our experience has shown the category of performance-enhancing drugs are most likely to be used. In a sense, they are high-risk drugs.

Before any further expansion of the drug-testing program into other sports or with other drugs, the Executive Committee would afford the membership the opportunity to review such action in advance. Let me try to explain briefly the scope and method of this testing program. Tests would be administered to all Divisions I-A and I-AA football programs for a total of 194 programs. Thirty-six athletes from each program would be tested essentially at random. Each team would be tested at least one time, and another 25 percent would be retested. And it is possible that a team could be tested a third time. The test would begin shortly after August 1, 1990, and on August 1, 1991, a second cycle would begin.

Each selection of players would be randomly done to the maximum extent possible. They would be administered in the summer. There would be a total of 8,748 tests administered each year at an estimated cost of \$2 million. This represents a \$1.6 million increase over the current budget, because \$400,000 has already been allocated for the voluntary program. That would be discontinued.

The question of sanctions follows next. If the athlete tests positive on any of these tests, he will be eligible for exactly the same sanctions that followed championship testing. This means that a positive test for anabolic steroids could mean a one-year suspension from competition for the athlete.

Assuming that No. 52 passes, a second positive test would result in a life-time ban from NCAA competition. Ladies and gentlemen, the dangers to the health of the athlete who use these drugs is clear and present. The competitive advantages provided to the user of enhancing drug substances is obvious. For those reasons, we strongly urge the passage of this legislation. Thank you.

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to ask a question. What happens if this passes and in a state like ours, where this sort of testing is declared by Supreme Court decision to be illegal, what does the NCAA do about that?

Mr. Bozik: The response I have had from the legal counsel of the NCAA is that up until now those challenges have been met. I believe Washington was tested in a bowl situation this year. That is a legal question that I am not qualified to answer. You, sir, are better qualified than I.

President Witte: Well, that is a matter of opinion. (Laughter) It sounded to me as the chair, that it is a question that cannot be answered definitively at this time. I assume that we would have to have a particular case of controversy and litigate it before we could evaluate the impact or potential conflict between our regulations and a particular state's laws. Obviously, that is speculative at this time, and I am not sure to what extent it is relevant to the decision on the proposal on whether or not to adopt No. 53.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): Following up on the last comments, it is, I think, a serious question for all of us that are state institutions. Basically, what we are looking at is the potential for variable enforcement according to the different jurisdictions of

the United States that have different kinds of rules in terms of the testability of people for drugs under circumstances. I think it is not entirely responsible to suggest that because a school was tested at a place away from the state in which the constitutional rule against the test applies that somehow or other that resolves the question. We can do no better than understand that there is a potential for 50 different applications of this rule according to the 50 different state constitutions.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): There were several Division II delegates, and I hope more of them might address the issue, who assumed this would apply to Division II. We have heard now that it will apply for a two-year period to only Divisions I-A and I-AA football. Could I, prior to making another comment, ask at what time will Division II institutions experience this year-round testing program?

Mr. Bozik: I believe, if I remember in my remarks, I noted that this is authorizing legislation and the Executive Committee would announce in advance any intention to test other divisions or for other drugs in time for this Convention to act on them if they so choose.

Mr. Barkey: If this passed then, at any time the Council could enact testing for Division II?

Mr. Bozik: No, sir. The Executive Committee would make a decision but it would make it in advance of the Convention, and the Convention would have an opportunity to say "no".

Mr. Barkey: I certainly think the national Association, which sponsors championship events, has every right and certainly a responsibility to test student-athletes prior to entering the national championship events. The national Association does not sponsor our intercollegiate programs, and I am speaking to Division II representatives. They do not sponsor your intercollegiate programs; your university sponsors those. I hope you would allow your administration to determine what experiences your student-athletes should have regarding national year-round testing.

There are great legal issues involved here, and some of our campuses are much different than others. I hope that you might allow your administration to make that determination and not the National Association.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): Mr. Chair, I have serious problems with the announcement you made a few minutes ago that you were advised that there are no legal problems with this proposal that are different than those that already are applicable. I do not think anybody in this room is in a position to say with any degree of definitiveness that that is the case.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-61) was approved by all divisions, 272-39, seven abstentions, in Division I; 138-23 in Division II; 159-49, three abstentions in Division III, all roll-call votes.]

Mr. Bozik: A point of clarification, Mr. President. The question asked earlier was a legitimate question concerning the application

of No. 52 as it applies to individual drug-testing programs conducted on campuses. I think it would be appropriate for the staff to answer that question. The question that basically exists is this: if you have your own drug-testing program on your campus, with sanctions that may differ from those that we have passed under No. 53 or 52, which one pertains to your campus?

It is my understanding that the campus rule applies to your campus test and NCAA rule applies to NCAA testing.

Graduate-Student Eligibility

B.J. Skelton (Clemson University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

This NCAA Council proposal has the same motivation as No. 42 that we acted upon earlier. It is another step toward federation that the membership apparently prefers. This amendment does not change any current rule in any way. It simply turns a dominant provision, which requires a two-thirds vote of everyone to change, into a federated provision where each division can act separately in the future by majority vote. This proposal states that our legislation dealing with the eligibility of graduate students can be handled separately by the divisions in the future. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-66) was approved.]

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): For the membership, on the National Letter of Intent program and while we are all here in focus, we would like to clarify information on passage of Proposal No. 26, which basically says that it permits a partial qualifier to receive institutional financial aid based on demonstrated financial need but the source of such aid may not be athletically related.

Thus, partial qualifiers are not eligible for athletics grants-in-aid. The National Letter of Intent program is a voluntary program for Division I and Division II member institutions. In that National Letter of Intent program, Item 2 requires the awarding of financial aid at the time of the signing for the National Letter to be valid.

So a steering committee has met, and we would like to issue this interpretation for your information at this time. To determine the status of a qualifier and partial qualifier, it probably will take until at least July because the last ACT, SAT test, I believe, is given in June and those results will probably not be ready for you until July.

So, the interpretation simply is this: Since a partial qualifier is not eligible for athletics aid, for anyone who signs the National Letter and ends up being a partial qualifier, that letter will be null and void. That is different than in the past.

Junior College Transfer Eligibility—Discontinued/Nonprovisional Sport Exception

Douglas T. Porter (Fort Valley State College): On behalf of the Council and the Division II Steering Committee, I would like to

move the adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to permit a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, transferring to Division I or Division II, to choose exemption of certain normal eligibility rulings. Although Division I and Division II have different requirements for immediate eligibility, each division requires a transfer to reside a full academic year at the institution. This will confirm that a partial qualifier or nonqualifier transferring to a Division I or Division II institution from a two-year college or a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program shall not be permitted to utilize the discontinued/nonsponsored sport exception to the transfer residence requirement. The Council urges your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-67) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Transfer Eligibility

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal would codify a long-standing interpretation regarding the application of the Association's transfer legislation as it relates to the transfer of a student-athlete from any four-year collegiate institution to a Division I or Division II member institution. The adoption of this proposal would confirm that the waivers of and the exceptions to the transfer residence requirement listed in Bylaw 14.6.5.3 are not available for partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers until they have completed an academic year of full-time enrollment.

Only qualifiers may utilize such waivers and exceptions during the first academic year of full-time collegiate attendance. Again, this proposal merely would confirm and clarify the current interpretation of this legislation. Both the Legislation and Interpretations Committee and the Council urge you to adopt Proposal No. 63.

[Proposal No. 63 (Page A-67) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

One-Time Transfer Exception—Financial Aid

R. Dale Smith (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Metro Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

We present this proposal as a regular regulation of this Association into compliance with its actions. Please note that only Item C of the one-time transfer waiver provision will be deleted by this proposal. All others remain in place. As an administrator dealing with transfer situations, I assure you that the existing fraud plus the full language of the criteria in C provides the language necessary. In many institutions, the coach and the student-athlete feel compelled to offer false information; and if it fails to present satis-

factory results with the institution's compliance coordinator, they are simply throwing athletes off the team on the last day of the spring term to meet the current provisions.

Even with Item C deleted, such controls remain in place, including, first and foremost, the permission of the previous institution; secondly, that it is available only to sports other than football and basketball, and ice hockey, and third, student-athletes who have not transferred previously. Fourth, the student-athletes must be in good academic standing and make satisfactory progress. Fifth, the National Letter of Intent will prohibit any use of this waiver prior to the student-athletes completing their initial year of enrollment.

This proposal does not open the door to transfer chaos. What you have now is what would exist with the passage of this proposal. This merely eliminates the existing hypocrisy and simplifies the procedure. We urge your support.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I would like to speak in support of this motion. When the multitransfer rule was officially passed, there was a great deal of suspicion. The next couple of years the attempt was made to rescind. In response to those attempts, this Item C was built stronger to negate absolutely the ability of any student with institutional athletics financial aid to transfer and immediately be eligible.

There are circumstances where the student has good reason for transferring; and if an institution wishes to support that, the only way that can be done now is by being less than candid on the forms that are signed to insure that process. There are enough safeguards for the institutions that wish to not release the student to take that advantage; and for the institution that would like to release the student, this provision makes that possible. I urge you support good legislation.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Speaking on behalf of the Interpretations Committee, I would just like to bring the delegates' attention to the effective date of this legislation. If it is adopted, it would not become immediately effective. It would not affect athletes who are currently fulfilling a residence requirement. They would not become eligible at the conclusion of the Convention this afternoon.

Robert W. Sankey (University of Arizona): I would like to remind the Convention that an affirmative vote on this proposal would entirely change the original intent of this exemption option. Those who were in the Convention at the time this was adopted will recall that this was set up explicitly to allow the student who, for one reason or another, was not able to compete and participate effectively in the institution that he or she chose, to have the option to move to another program where that student might have the option to participate.

It seems to me that it clearly was done at that time solely for that specific case. We now hear arguments that some institutions are manipulating this option and that it is common practice to misuse

it. I, for one, will state that at least at our institution, and I think at many other institutions, it is not common practice. It is certainly not our practice. It is not my practice as a faculty athletics representative to allow this to be a general-transfer option.

I believe that the residence requirement has served us well for transfer students. I think by passing this proposal, it will indeed largely negate the current residence requirement. I think that would be detrimental to the student and certainly to the interest of intercollegiate athletics. I urge its defeat.

R. Dale Smith (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): I would agree that this was not the original intent of the Council; but as you recall, last year with the Ivy League proposal there was a change in the original intent and we adopted the revision to allow for someone who is thrown off the team. I think there has been an evolution, and I think today is the time to recognize that evolution and adopt this proposal.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-68) was approved by Division I (175-125) and by Division II.]

Transfer Eligibility—"4-2-4" College Transfers

Mandell Glicksberg (University of Florida): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that the minimum 24-semester or 36-quarter hours presented by a student-athlete who transfers from a four-year college to a two-year college and then to the certifying institution shall be transferrable degree credit hours and shall include a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 from the two-year college. This proposal would make the 14.6.6 "4-2-4" college transfer requirement consistent with the other transfer requirements in this regard. I might also point out that this proposal, although it is effective immediately, is not retroactive. It will apply only to students entering the two-year college from this time on. On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-69) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Legislative Calendar

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 68 is an attempt to further refine and fine-tune the revised legislative calendar approved by the membership at last year's Convention, which becomes effective this February and will be for preparation of legislation for next year's Convention. This proposal does three things. First, the proposal will foster better communications on proposals sponsored for the national office and

interested third parties by requiring the sponsors of the proposal to identify the primary contact person.

Second, by requiring the submission of the dissemination of the short statement of intent and rationale to lessen the chance the proposal be misunderstood by the national office or the membership at large. If adopted, the sponsor will have the opportunity to explain why the proposal should be supported rather than the current practice of only permitting the limited intent statement, which indicates what the proposal will do.

Third, this proposal will make the legislative process less rigid and more flexible by creating a two-month window of opportunity where a sponsor may then propose amendments-to-amendments consistent with the original intent, even if the amended proposal increases the modification contained in the original legislation. Currently, our amendment-to-amendment process does not permit permissive modification, a restriction which has been most difficult when the original sponsor discovers a proposal they submitted has not accomplished what they submitted it for.

It does not change the new calendar adopted last year, merely enhances what we accomplished with the deadlines for submission of amendments-to-amendments. I urge your support of Proposal No. 68.

[Proposal No. 68 was approved.]

National Collegiate Men's and Women's Fencing Championships

Royce N. Flippen Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Executive Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bylaw 18.2.1 states that any championship that falls below the required minimum sponsorship for two consecutive years will be automatically discontinued. However, National Collegiate Championships, such as fencing, that were established prior to the 1982-83 academic year are exempt from the bylaw as long as 50 member institutions sponsor the sport. In 1988-89, 51 member-institutions sponsored men's fencing and 48 sponsored women's fencing. This year, only 48 institutions sponsored men's fencing and 49 sponsored women's fencing. Therefore, both championships are in jeopardy of being discontinued.

As a result of the decline in sponsorship and in response to a directive by the Executive Committee, the Men's and Women's Fencing Committees have recommended that a combined-scoring National Collegiate Men's and Women's Fencing Championship be conducted beginning in 1990. This responsible restructuring will preserve fencing as an NCAA-sponsored championship. The NCAA Council is sponsoring this proposal, and it has the support of the Executive Committee. I strongly urge your support.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-74) was approved.]

**Membership—Effective Dates and Division III
Financial Aid Requirements**

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that membership election in multidivision classification and reclassification are effective September 1 of the year the applicant's institution meets the criteria or January 1 following the Convention for the institutions who receive waivers of the criteria for multidivision classification or a change in division membership. This is primarily housekeeping in nature. Second, this proposal specifies that during the two-year compliance period a member institution applying for Division III membership or seeking to reclassify its sport to Division III may not provide athletically related financial aid to incoming freshmen or transfer students.

However, continuing students would still be able to receive athletically related aid during the two-year compliance period. The Division III Steering Committee believes that students entering institutions applying for the Division III membership during the institution's two-year compliance period should be required to abide by the Division III financial aid regulations. I urge adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-77) was approved by all divisions.]

Sports and Rules Committees—Composition Requirements

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal may well have been placed in the consent package, because I can't imagine why anyone would be opposed to it. It was recommended by the Council, the Committee on Review and Planning, and the Council subcommittee to review minority opportunities in intercollegiate athletics, which I chair. The proposal says that when an associate or assistant athletic director serves on an NCAA sports committee or rules committee, that individual can be counted toward meeting the minimum requirement for administrators on such a committee.

Those individuals already serve on those committees, but currently they don't count in meeting the administrative requirement. We think that allowing these individuals to count in that manner may result in more people being appointed to such committees. This would open up committee service in the NCAA to a group of talented individuals who play important roles in our campus athletics programs, and many of them have expertise in service quarters. Perhaps more importantly, we can provide representation on these important committees.

On behalf of the Council, I urge your approval of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-80) was approved by all divisions.]

Division I Men's Basketball Committee

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, the intent is pretty clear, specifies that the membership of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee should include one member from each of the four Division I men's basketball regions and five members selected at large. Because of the national scope of men's basketball in Division I and men's basketball championships, it is important that maximum opportunities exist for the most qualified individuals to serve on the committee. The current requirement that each region be represented by two individuals, with a single at-large position available, does not provide adequate flexibility in that regard.

Reducing the minimum requirement to one member per region and increasing the number of at-large positions would provide national geographic representation and would permit the best qualified representatives to serve. The number of institutions in the national geographical regions is disproportionate. As an example, there are 48 institutions in the West Region and 96 in the East. The current legislation provides each region the same representation despite the disproportionate numbers.

It should also be noted that the membership on the Division I Women's Basketball Committee is not restricted by regional representation, and that committee has proven that its charge can be carried out successfully. Proposal No. 78 has the support of the Executive Committee, and I urge your adoption.

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-81) was approved by all divisions.]

Division II Men's Basketball Committee

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Council and the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, Division II basketball is divided into eight regions with the current six-man structure that does not allow all eight regions to be represented during the time of selection. The Council and the Executive Committee, believe this proposal will be important to the enhancement of the Division II Men's Basketball Championship, and I would urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-81) was approved by all divisions.]

Men's and Women's Fencing Committee

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Executive Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal and the just-approved Proposal No. 70 is to establish the combined-scoring National Collegiate Fencing Champion-

ship were submitted by the NCAA Men's and Women's Fencing Committees to the Council simultaneously. The Men's and Women's Fencing Committees agree that, first, a combined committee should be established, consisting of only eight members. Currently six members serve on each of the fencing committees for a total of 12. It was agreed that the combined committee should decrease from 12 to eight through attrition.

Secondly, the committee should have championships administration responsibilities only. Currently, the Men's Fencing Committee has playing-rules responsibility. However, the committee, both committees, agree that the combined committee would adopt United States Fencing Association rules for the combined championships and modify them as necessary. The Council is sponsoring this proposal. It has the support of the Executive Committee, and I strongly urge your support.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-82) was approved by all divisions.]

Resolution: Junior College Relations Committee

Barbara S. Stone (California State University, Fullerton): Mr. President, on behalf of the Big West Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 82

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, community colleges are an important part of the academic landscape. They provide the first two years of college, particularly for those students who cannot afford to move away from home. Many of the athletes who end up in our Divisions I, II and III schools attend these institutions. Let me suggest to you that their rules are very different than ours, and it is important that we have a formal communications link with them. Prior to the NCAA reorganization in the middle 1980's, there was such a committee. As far as we can tell, it fell between the cracks when we tried to reduce the number of NCAA committees. It is important, I think, that we reestablish the link. Proposition No. 82 encourages or suggests that the Council reestablish the committee, and we are urging you to support it.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-83) was approved.]

Broken-Time Payments

Joseph L. Kearney (Western Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I am chair of the NCAA Special Committee on Amateurism, and on behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is a very real assist to our leading athletes who want to take advantage of international competition. This proposal is also a very positive step in improving relations between the NCAA and the USOC. In advancing this proposal, the committee had considerable dialogue with both the USOC and the national governing bodies. I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

Robert A. Bowlsby (University of Northern Iowa): Our Special Committee to Review Amateurism has forwarded this legislation

as an accommodation to many of America's elite athletes who happen to be members of our collegiate teams. Over the past year, our committee has met with many of the sports governing groups and has consequently sought to present legislation in two areas: one, the accommodation of elite athletes, and, two, the encouragement of grass-roots developmental activities.

Consistent with the former, Proposal No. 83 will allow student-athletes in the so-called Olympic sports to receive up to \$250 per week to replace the employment earnings lost while training and competing on America's national teams as defined in Bylaw 14. It is our opinion that these student-athletes should not be forced to forego summer earnings in order to compete on the national teams. It is important to note that all funds distributed must be administered by the USOC or by the national governing body for the sport in which the student-athlete competes.

It is also important to note that the \$250 figure is consistent with the national average summary income for college students. It is the desire of our committee to support America's international efforts while adhering to the ideals of the NCAA definition of amateurism. In the spirit of cooperation and in consideration of our student-athletes, I urge your support of No. 83.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I want a clarification. Is this for only American athletes or are we talking about foreign athletes that compete at our U.S. institutions?

President Witte: The interpretation that was circulated in the blue pages regarding this proposal indicates that this proposal would require the payments both on the domestic and foreign nationals' sports governing bodies.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-84) was approved.]

Forms of Pay—U.S. Olympic Committee Insurance Program

Judith R. Holland (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Council and the Special Committee to Review Amateurism, I move adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

Without repeating everything said by the former speakers, this proposal is in the same spirit as Proposal No. 83. It is straightforward, and I think it is clearly stated in your book. As an added note here, this will not be any added expense for member institutions and it does not provide any competitive or recruiting advantage to anyone. Simply stated, it provides adequate protection for students who qualify for this insurance. We urge its adoption.

Theodore S. Paulaskas (St. Anslem College): Since an insurance program appears to be a means of guarding against the risk of potential hardship that the student-athletes might experience in a medical crisis, many injuries that occur outside of the practicing competition within 24 hours of daily life can detract from athletics performance capabilities. The athlete who forgoes medical assistance through economics compromises his or her athletics potential

and athletics-development goals. Finally, such a proposal is consistent with recent NCAA legislation interpreted proposal. I urge your support

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-84) was approved.]

Actual and Necessary Expenses—Equipment and Apparel

Prentice Gautt (Big Eight Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues reviewed a list of actual and necessary expenses currently not permitted by the NCAA legislation or interpretations. One such item was practice or competition equipment and apparel for individual use. Consistent with its emphasis on encouraging the development of athletes at young ages who essentially participate in NCAA intercollegiate programs, the committee recommended that the NCAA legislation be modified to permit individuals to receive from amateur sports organizations, other than those specifically affiliated with member institutions, individual equipment and apparel for practice and competition for individual use.

There are seven points or arguments upon which this proposal is couched.

1. Permitting the receipt of the equipment and apparel is a means of supporting the athletics development of athletes at young ages.

2. By allowing such in-kind support rather than money, the assistance is directly ear-marked and applicable to athletics development.

3. The provision of such items would not increase costs of member institutions inasmuch as such apparel and equipment must be provided from outside amateur sports teams or organizations.

4. The proposal is carefully designed to prevent possible recruiting abuses by prohibiting teams or organizations affiliated with member institutions from providing such apparel and equipment.

5. Apparel and equipment for team use is currently permissible under NCAA amateurism regulations.

6. For most sports, especially those in the specific nonrevenue sports, equipment represents a major expense that precludes many athletes from reaching their potentials.

7. The proposal permits the receipt of such equipment and apparel from outside amateur sports teams and organizations but not from a manufacturer or other commercial entity.

The committee believes that it is the right thing to do. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 85 (Page A-85) was approved.]

Permissible Awards

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chair, in behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 86 attacks a simplified, deregulated Association's current legislation related to specific items that student-athletes may receive as awards. Currently, the NCAA Manual lists certain items that are permissible as awards, provided they are personalized properly. However, past experience has shown that the list is not all-inclusive and probably never can be exhausted.

Rather than revising the list per items, the Legislative Review Committee is recommending that as long as an item is properly personalized with the insignia or letter of that event, or proper identification of any item, including merchandise items, the item may be given. You will note that there is some merchandise items on the list, such as clocks; radios; cameras; watches; and items that might not be personalized properly, such as gift certificates, which will continue to be prohibited.

The mechanism by which the Association prevents the receipt of awards, where measures are not already properly in place, is by the use of a specific dollar limit on every award and category. The committee believes that the dollar limit is sufficient to prevent abuse, and I urge your support of this proposal.

Transportation Between Terms

Gerald M. Lage (Oklahoma State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, the problem addressed here is to permit athletics department staff members to provide local transportation for student-athletes returning to campus for competition during midterm vacation periods. In our case, for example, the airport is located nearly 80 miles from campus. Taxi service is prohibitive and bus terminals are several miles from the airport with service being quite inconvenient.

Last year, approval was given for members of the athletics staff, as opposed to coaches, to provide the allowable transportation from terminal to campus. The request now is to extend the ability of the department to provide this to enrolled student-athletes under very carefully controlled conditions, namely, for those few athletes that must be returned to campus for competition actually occurring between fall and spring semester for the two quarter breaks during the academic year with requirement of actual competition during the break.

Very few students would be affected and the added cost would be very modest. You have a responsible person meeting the student to transport him or her. The added cost in traveling to these campuses would remain and the ability to arrange the competition-related travel would remove the temptation to violate current restrictions; and in bad weather, at this time, schedules or lack of alternatives dictate the only responsible action is to go pick up the student-athlete. I urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-87) was approved.]

Academic Awards Banquet

Joseph S. Boland III (Auburn University): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

With the increased emphasis on academics over the past few years, many institutions have looked for ways to recognize outstanding academic performance and motivate all athletes to strive for academic excellence. One way to accomplish this goal is with annual academic awards. Proposition 88 is permissive legislation. It will allow those institutions that currently have all three awards banquets permissible under the NCAA Article 16.1.6 to add an academics awards banquet. Those institutions that currently conduct fewer than three banquets will not be totally disadvantaged. Otherwise, I assume they will already be conducting three. While this legislation will propose a cost increase for those institutions that choose to have additional banquets, I can think of no better way to spend money that is raised by athletics than for those athletes who have achieved academic excellence to be honored and to motivate all student-athletes to do all they can academically and athletically.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-87) was approved.]

Women's Volleyball

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the sponsors, I would just like to say that the intent of this legislation is not to bring back athletes to their individual campuses any earlier than they might already be coming back but rather to establish a consistent starting date for the first contest and to equate the number of practice opportunities that each institution has before their first contest. We feel that because of the different references that exist in the first day of classes among most of our institutions, that this legislation is necessary in order to create a fair playing field for all institutions.

The same philosophy and procedure is used in the sport of football in determining the start of playing and practice season, and we feel it should be the same for volleyball. We urge your support of this amendment.

Christine W. Hoyles (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. Chair, I am chair of the Division I Women's Volleyball Committee. On behalf of that committee, I urge your support of Proposal No. 100. The adoption of this proposal would not substantially change the date on which volleyball teams would arrive at campus to practice. For example, the practice would be moved back three or four days for those institutions that start the classes in late August.

The cost attached to this program is negligible. While we acknowledge that cost reduction is an important issue, the issue of

health and safety of the student-athletes is also a consideration. Volleyball players require adequate time to prepare physically for their first competition. These student-athletes should not be overlooked in order to save a few hundred dollars. This proposal has the support of the American Volleyball Coaches Association.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-96) was approved by all divisions.]

Season-Ending Volleyball Tournament

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the sponsors, I urge your support of this proposal. Most of you are aware of the large number of Division I schools sponsoring women's volleyball. The 263 teams approach the number of men's basketball teams in Division I. Yet only 32 teams—32 versus 64—qualify for the NCAA tournament. The Women's Invitational Volleyball Championship provides 16 additional teams the opportunity to participate in a postseason championship.

Many conferences, predominantly in the eastern part of the United States, do not have automatic bids and have no reasonable chance to be selected for the NCAA championship at large. The Women's Invitational Championship addresses the needs of these programs without denying opportunities to play a full season during the regular season. Please support Proposal No. 101.

Paige E. Mulhollan (Wright State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to add my support and urge you to support this proposition. I think all of us in the Convention are sensitive to the feelings of this organization as was expressed in Proposition 30 and the desire to limit seasons and demands on student-athletes' time. We also are aware of the proposition in No. 30-A, which will result in a study during the coming year that may reduce time constraints on athletes.

We also are aware that in the course of discussion of those matters a great number of exemptions were supported for such sports as men's basketball in which instances they have been successful in promoting that particular sport. Women's volleyball has developed in such a way that only a very small number of teams can participate in postseason activities, and yet the potential of that sport for success on our campuses remains quite great.

The purpose of No. 101 is to allow the development of NIT-type alternatives and to exempt participation for one season-ending tournament. It seems equitable to women's sports and consistent with our activities yesterday, and I urge your support.

Christine W. Hoyles (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Division I Women's Volleyball Committee, I urge your support of this proposal as well. As described by the previous speakers, it allows institutions desiring to improve their volleyball programs the opportunity to participate in a postseason tournament experience. I should note that the AVCA also enthusiastically supports

this proposal.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): A point of clarification from the sponsors. Is this only those championships that are listed, or is it any one season-ending body or championship?

President Witte: Well, although the chair is not part of the sponsors, I would read the letters "e.g." as not limiting this legislation to those championships listed there.

Mr. Rienzo (Georgetown University): So, it is the interpretation that it can be as many season-ending volleyball tournaments as may exist as long as each school competes in only one?

President Witte: That is correct.

Sandra L. Vivas (American Volleyball Coaches Association): Mr. President, I am executive director of the American Volleyball Coaches Association. The intent of the legislation is those tournaments listed.

[Proposal No. 101 (Page A-98) was approved by all divisions.]

Season-Ending Fencing Tournament

Robert J. Myslik (Princeton University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, it is important to know that Proposal No. 102 does not increase the number of allowable dates of competition in the sport of fencing. It merely is amending the bylaw to allow all member institutions sponsoring fencing to take advantage of the bylaw provisions. Currently, the bylaw states that the maximum number of dates of fencing competition can exclude competition in one conference championship meet. However, because only five member conferences sponsor men's and women's fencing, this bylaw is applicable only to a relatively few member institutions. Should this proposal pass, all member institutions sponsoring fencing would be able to exclude one season-ending tournament, either a conference championship or regional tournament. The Council is sponsoring this proposal and I urge your support.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Mr. Chair, I have a question for the sponsor. Our conference perhaps is a little bit different than some in that our conference championship takes place in the latter portion of the season but not necessarily as an unseeded championship. In checking with the interpretation staff at the center, they indicated that they felt the legislation did not necessarily anticipate this situation. All that was available to them was a literal reading of the legislation. Is the intent of the sponsors to preclude this type of conference championship from being included among the exclusions?

Mr. Myslik: My understanding is that it is either a conference championship or a season-ending regional tournament.

Mr. Rasmussen: Your interpretation is this conference championship could be excluded, even though it is not season-ending per se?

Mr. Myslik: Yes.

President Witte: I think in fairness to the previous answer to the question I should say that the two members of the staff on the podium do not agree with the interpretation given. As I understand it, they construe season-ending more literally.

Mr. Rasmussen: In that case, I would like the intent of the sponsors noted for the record so we can pursue this on behalf of the conference with the Legislative Interpretations Committee.

Marjorie N. Tversky (Columbia University-Barnard College): I just want to clarify that the intent was not to increase the number of contests but rather to allow season-ending regional championships, which in many cases have gone on for a number of years and been substituted for a conference championship in the way that the NCAA permits. It is not increasing the allowable excluded championships.

President Witte: I think that all we can do, though, to resolve this uncertainty is have the sponsors ask the Council to clarify it and to deal with this issue at its first available opportunity.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-98) was approved by all divisions.]

Prospective Student-Athlete

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Recruiting, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Recruiting Committee has reviewed concerns expressed by the membership regarding the definition of the prospective student-athletes. In order to clarify the application of the NCAA legislation under these circumstances, the committee with the NCAA Council's support is recommending Proposal No. 104 be adopted.

Proposal No. 104 will clarify for purposes of NCAA recruiting legislation the distinction between the prospective student-athletes and a recruited prospective student-athlete. This proposal stipulates that the prospective student-athlete is an individual who has started classes for the ninth grade, and such individual can be considered to be included if the prospective student-athlete's member institution is involved in any of the recruiting activities stipulated in NCAA Bylaw 13.02.9.1 as listed in the proposal.

We believe that this proposal will help member institutions in determining the proper application of various recruiting and financial aid regulations by clarifying the reference to the individuals affected by those regulations. On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, we ask your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-99) was approved by all divisions.]

Official ACT and SAT Scores

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, effective in August 1990, there is a Council-approved interpretation that says for certifying the standardized test score of entering student-athletes the institutions are to use a copy of the scores that it received directly from either ACT or SAT. The purpose of this legislation is simply to permit an institution that does not already have a copy directly submitted from the testing agency to procure at its expense rather than the prospect's expense a clean copy of the so-called sticker. I urge approval.

Carl C. James (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chair, if this passes, which we hope it does, we would urge the Academic Requirements Committee to work out a common procedure whereby all institutions would be on the same page in obtaining these test scores. In other words, does the institution go to the prospective student-athlete, and how does he or she get reimbursed for this?

Mr. Hobbs: Mr. James, first, the student does not get reimbursed. The expectation is that the institution will get a release from the student to request a copy of the scores. The money will then be sent by the institution to the testing agency. However, the Academic Requirements Committee anticipates the development of a form that constitutes sort of a common release.

Olin B. Sansbury Jr. (University of South Carolina at Spartanburg): In the Division II meeting, did we not change the requirement on obtaining the ACT and SAT score so the institution could obtain that from the individual's high school transcript?

President Witte: Yes.

Mr. Sansbury: So we don't have quite the same reason in Division II. The other question I have is normally a student would pay to obtain or send for his ACT or SAT score to an institution, would he not, and aren't we not treating the athletes differently?

Mr. Hobbs: No. Normally the student pays to take the test and indicates the institutions to which he wishes the scores sent. This is designed to help an institution get a quick, direct report on those occasions when it has not been given the score directly. A number of institutions have expressed concern about taking test scores off a Xerox transcript. You can do an awful lot by Xeroxing a Xerox of a Xerox. This protects the institution. The fee is moderate, and I think it will allow a lot of certifying officers to sleep a little more soundly at night. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-101) was approved by all divisions.]

Printed Recruiting Aids

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit a member institution to provide any necessary preenrollment information to a prospective student-athlete who has signed the National Letter of Intent or who has been accepted officially for enrollment by a member institution that does not participate in the National Letter of Intent program. Currently, Bylaw 13.3.1 mentions only the submission of weight-lift-

ing information to prospects in this context. The adoption of this legislation will confirm that member institutions also may forward to signed or accepted prospects additional information regarding academics, orientation, conditioning, practice activities and the NCAA procedures should they desire a career in athletics. Both the Legislation and Interpretation Committee, and the Council urge your adoption of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 112 (Page A-107) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Joanne Fortunato (Keene State College): Mr. Chair and delegates: In addition to those individuals recognized on Sunday, please add the following:

Leslie C. Avery, Washington University
J. Shober Barr, Franklin and Marshall College
Joe Davis, Rice University
Bradley Dewey, Franklin and Marshall College
Charles M. Hoard, Lincoln University (Missouri)
James Lester, Emory University
Thomas McDonough, Emory University
James W. Moore, Southern Connecticut State University
Reed K. Swenson, Weber State University

COMMITTEE REPORTS

[NOTE. The delegates heard the report of the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee and approved the slate of candidates.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Post-High School Visits

C.J. Slanicka (Ohio State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

In a manner consistent with its intent in Proposal No. 114, which has already been passed by Division I, the Recruiting Committee has developed Proposal No. 115 to clarify the application of the Association's recruiting rules governing post-high school visits by prospective student-athletes. Proposal No. 115, which is sponsored by the Council and the Recruiting Committee, would specify that the numerical limitations associated with the official visit set forth in Bylaw 13.6.1 apply separately in Division I to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period October 15th following the prospect's completion of high school. Please also note that the reference to Division III as a last sentence to this proposal should be deleted since Division III does not have a limit on the number of institutions from which the prospect may receive an official visit.

We believe this proposal clarifies the application of the Associa-

tion's limitations on visits. The Council and the Recruiting Committee urge your support.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-108) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Official Visits—Prospects Entertainment Expenses

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move the adoption of the Amendment-to-Amendment No. 116—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is designed to specify the cost of all entertainment realized by a student host or provided the prospective student-athlete or the prospective student-athlete's parents, legal guardians or spouse during an official visit, except for meals and campus athletic events must be included in the \$20 or the \$10 for Divisions II and III per-day entertainment allowance provided the student host.

In other words, the formal recruiting activity—the summer recruiting activities, such as boat rides, horseback riding, ski rental, snow mobile and other assorted activities—the cost of that at the regular normal charge must be included as part of this \$20 per-day entertainment allowance. Amendment No. 116—1, with the insertion of "campus athletics events" and the elimination of the parenthetical phrase, was introduced by the Legislation and Interpretations Committee merely to specify and to clarify the amendment.

So, the question before the delegates, then, is whether all the entertainment will be provided out of the normal expense allotment of \$20, with the exception of meals and admissions to campus athletics events.

[Proposal No. 116—1 (Page A-109) was approved by all divisions.]

Mr. Yeager: I move adoption of Amendment-to-Amendment 116—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of No. 116—2 is to move the effective date to August 1, 1990, rather than an immediate effective date. The Interpretations Committee believes that it is important because we are in the middle of a recruiting year, and a number of student-athletes have taken visits to institutions now on a different standard. We urge your support and adoption of No. 116—2.

[Proposal No. 116—2 (Page A-110) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-109) was approved by all divisions as amended by Nos. 116—1 and 116—2.]

Official Visits—Student Host Entertainment Allowance

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, I believe it is in order at this time to move the Amendment-to-Amendment No. 117—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Amendment-to-Amendment, Mr. Chair, merely changes the effective date from immediately to August 1, 1990.

[Proposal No. 117—1 (Page A-110) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Mr. Allison: Proposal No. 117 is an attempt to increase the permissible entertainment allowance for a prospective student-athlete during an official visit to a Division II or III member institution. Currently, the limitation permits an institutional host to receive \$10 a day for daily entertainment allowances when hosting a prospective student-athlete during the official visit. The proposal, if adopted, would permit the student host to receive \$20 per day for the allowance. The adoption of the proposal would increase from \$5 to \$10 the additional daily allowance for each additional prospect that a host entertains at a Division II or Division III institution. The NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee urge your support of the amended Proposal No. 117.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-110) was approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 117—1.]

Official Visits—Transportation

Donald C. Landry (Southland Conference): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Southland Conference has introduced this proposal primarily because of a need in I-AA football. The intent of this proposal is to permit any member of the institution's athletics department to provide transportation for a prospect in the sport of football to and from the prospect's home or educational institution in conjunction with an official visit.

Under the current NCAA rules, staff members are only permitted to transport prospects to and from the member institution to the nearest train station, airport, or bus station on the occasion of the official visits or initial enrollments. Otherwise, only head coaches and full-time assistants are permitted to go off-campus and provide automobile transportation to prospects. As a general rule, most I-AA institutions recruit from a local or regional area. Only a limited number of prospects will fly in for their official visits.

In the recruiting of football prospects, most schools have weekends when large number of prospects make their official visits. On these weekends, the schools find themselves short-staffed to accommodate all of the transportation needs. Six is a maximum number of full-time assistant coaches allowed in I-AA. Many schools have fewer than that number. Often, we cannot physically handle the influx of recruits. We are keeping physically exhausted coaches on the road providing this transportation. There is very little time available to these coaches to visit with the other visiting prospects.

This proposal simply allows the necessary flexibility in the rules to allow for convenient transportation. It looks after the best interest of the assistant coaches and the prospects. We are not seeking a way to add additional recruits. There would be no additional cost involved. The same number of staff members will be on the road transporting the same number of prospects.

We are very concerned that we would be putting inexperienced staff members in a recruiting situation and, therefore, violations could occur. We already allow three staff members to pick up prospects at an airport, train station or bus station. We are not aware of violations that have occurred. Also, it is not too difficult to teach the staff members a few recruiting rules involved in these situations. Football coaches are strongly in support of this proposal. We believe that your coaches would be in support of this proposal. We encourage you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-112) was defeated in Division I-A and approved in Division I-AA. It was determined to be inapplicable to Divisions II and III.]

Local Sports Clubs

Margaret Gatz (University of Southern California): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to change from 30 to 50 miles the radius within which the prospects who are participating in local sports clubs must live. The rationale is this: 30 miles is basically an arbitrary figure, and we would like to argue that this particular arbitrary figure is no longer realistic and to offer to you an alternative arbitrary figure. Under current legislation, coaches are permitted to have local sports clubs; and these clubs have at least two purposes. They perform community service for local youngsters, and they offer supplementary income to compete in the Olympic sports.

Currently, the club and all its participants must be within 30 miles of the university, and this is the figure we are asking to be changed. The 30 miles for a prospective athlete is no longer realistic, considering both large urban areas and rural areas. Coaches themselves often live more than 30 miles away from the university and are interested in running clubs in their home community. Parents often reside more than 30 miles from the university that offers the sports related to youngsters' participation.

Indeed, I would call to your attention that developmental clinics operate in a 100-mile radius. Consequently, we ask your support to change the local sports club team radius from 30 to 50 miles as our nominee for a realistic, arbitrary figure.

[Proposal No. 122 (Page A-114) was approved by all Divisions.]

Recreational Activities—Swimming

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chair, in

behalf of the 22 sponsors, I move Proposal No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 124 asks the membership to recognize differences in the sport of swimming, which have an impact on recreational activities during the official and unofficial visits to college campuses, particularly in Division I. Division II already has tryouts and Proposal No. 123 now allows visiting prospects in Division III to participate in any recreational activity on campus. Thus, as mentioned by the chair, this is really a Division I proposal.

Like the lead athletes in other sports, other things count during off-campus visits, substituting running and other recreational activities during campus visits. Our lead prospect cannot replace any more workouts from the activities. They are faced with up to 15 days of no workouts in their sport during those critical days of their training for NCAA National Collegiate Championship competition, which is the same period when there are no campus visits, trying to make decisions on which college to attend.

This would allow prospects to go to camp or schools on their own during physical workouts. This would create no recruiting advantage for anyone. Swimming is a time sport where coaches know exactly what the capabilities of prospects are, and they don't need to see them swim. This proposal would prohibit a tryout or observation situation. Allowing swimmers to work out in the pool may be a safer activity than walking across campus. There should be no concern for liability problems. There appears to be good reason for opposing this proposed exception to the prohibition against visitation and recreational activities. The sponsors would ask your support of 124.

[Proposal No. 124 (Page A-115) was defeated by Division I, determined to be inapplicable for Division II and moot for Division III due to approval of No. 123.]

Rescission of Official Visits—Transportation (No. 120)

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): Mr. Chair, I have a question on Proposal No. 120. I raised the question with the staff. The question was raised as to whether this would permit any athletics department staff member, regardless of full-time, part-time, graduate assistant, to go off campus to pick up a prospective student-athlete and to bring that student to campus for a visit? The interpretation that I received was yes, that any athletics department staff person, not just those people who are eligible to scout and recruit off campus. If that is, in fact, the case, I think we have passed a piece of legislation that needs to be rescinded, because I think that is bad legislation and not in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics. I would move to rescind.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-112) was rescinded in Division I-AA.]

Interpretation: Financial Aid

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon). I move adoption of Proposal No. 132.

[The motion was seconded.]

The position I am taking is to ask you to vote against the interpretation as it appears in No. 132. Unfortunately, this involves getting into a nice little book that we love so well, and I will have to ask you to indulge me for a couple of minutes of explanation. I will try to explain it in terms of the circumstances that we find at the University of Oregon, feeling that it is likely that many of the member-institutions are confronted with the same kind of situation.

The basic issue here has to do with the amount of financial aid available to our student-athletes who are living in off-campus housing. The basic situation that we are confronted with at the University of Oregon is on-campus housing available basically for our freshman class. It is the policy of the University of Oregon that after that freshman year our students in general should be in the community and not on campus. We don't have the resources to provide dorms for the entire student body. Our financial aid office determines for all students the appropriate amount of money that it takes to live in off-campus housing in Eugene, Oregon. That figure is published in the university catalog. It is used as the basis for determining financial aid for all students at the University of Oregon, whether a student-athlete or not a student-athlete.

We have used that published figure to determine the amount of aid to be given to student-athletes on athletics aid for the athletics program. We are now told by the interpretation initiative that under Bylaw 15.2.2.1.1, notwithstanding the fact that we have a published rate for off-campus housing that applies to all of our students, we have to use for our student-athletes the amount of costs associated with the on-campus housing, notwithstanding that housing is not available to them. That puts our student-athletes in a seriously disadvantaged position, vis-a-vis all the other students on campus who are eligible for aid. Nonathletes get their aid figures on the basis of what it is going to cost them to go out into the community and find a place to live. The student-athletes get their amount set in accordance with the heavily subsidized rate that actually reflects what campus housing costs.

We see this as a matter of serious unfairness to the student-athletes. We also see this interpretation as being inconsistent with the language of Bylaw 15.2.2.1, which states that a member institution must use its own campus room and board rate for determining the amount of similar expenses to be provided student-athletes who live off campus, unless the institution has no on-campus room and board facilities.

There are a number of problems with this interpretation on the merits. One is the matter I have already alerted you to. The student-athletes are disadvantaged vis-a-vis other students on the campus. I think the more serious one is that the tendency of this

interpretation will be to drive us to create dorm space on our campuses for our athletes, to get special preference for our athletes or access to dorm space that is now available to the student body primarily for the use of freshmen in our case. Indeed, to the extent that we are concerned that our student-athletes live a life similar to the lives of other students, we should not be encouraging athletics dorms, and the interpretation here does, in fact, provide an incentive to the creation of athletics dorms.

I request your vote against this interpretation, both because it is inconsistent with the language of the regulation and because it works a serious hardship on the student-athletes.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): The interpretation that has been adopted by the Council is the historic interpretation. Unlike the speaker's institution, many institutions do not have a published off-campus room and board allowance, which would lead many institutions to attempt to determine what standard of living in a community a figure should be attached. We all know that in different areas in our communities the cost of living in various neighborhoods can fluctuate significantly. This allows institutions to attempt to attach a stipend for off-campus housing that would vary and would also be an advantage to the urban schools over the rural schools, where in the cities where the cost of living is significantly higher. It would institute a stipend where what the student could be provided would be markedly different from those in less populated areas.

The on-campus room and board allowance is a figure that the institution can control. It is not designed to force students to live and reside on campus, but it is a figure that can be utilized consistently among the student body and again a figure that the institution can control. We believe that the overturn of the Council interpretation will be a chaotic step in attempting to assess the financial impact on a student-athlete and I would urge you to support the Council in this very important interpretation.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): With all due respect to the previous speaker, I would like to disagree. The University of Texas has a similar circumstance like Oregon. We have had two published on-campus and off-campus figures. Two years ago, we wrote to the NCAA and asked for an interpretation of that rule, and we were given a letter that said in the case where you have a published institutional catalog on-campus and off-campus figures, that they should be used even before any average of on-campus costs. So, I question the tradition.

Secondly, if you change this in mid-term for those of us who are using two different figures, you are going to change mid-year equivalencies. With regard to the statement on creating chaos, I would suggest that that change in mid-year, in terms of chaos, becomes at least one-half of it. No change leaves everybody exactly where they are. If you want to change it, you do it by legislation. Right now the interpretation really is not consistent with the lan-

guage in the book.

Karol A. Kahrs (University of Illinois, Champaign): I don't know that the problems in Texas and Oregon are so unique with respect to the fact that any student who must live off campus or chooses to live off campus usually does so at a higher rate of cost than that which exists on the campus. Thus, I think you have disenfranchised those people who have lived with that published rule of controlled costs forever, and I think Oregon would gain a definite advantage independently. Hopefully, I think that would be a disadvantage to everyone else. I don't think you are going to control the costs. You can modify or adjust to the need of the institution as Oregon has described it.

Mr. O'Fallon: I think the question of who gains the advantage is a very questionable one. The off-campus rate, as published for the University of Oregon, still means that our student-athletes receive a good deal less than the on-campus rates of a number of our sister-institutions, where room and costs are in the metropolitan area higher. There seems to be a subtle suggestion here of potential for corruption. There is, I guess, if you have financial aid officers on your campuses who are willing to spend time in Federal prisons, because they are the ones who have to establish as part of their responsibility for the determining of financial aid eligibility for students on your campus and what that rate is. I suggest that the only difference that exists among institutions in this room, who do administer Federally based financial aid is that some publish that rate in their catalogs and others do not. That is the only difference, and there is no great significant possibility for corruption.

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): We have been working on getting a level playing field. That interpretation will put a big gap in there. There is a lot of difference in what it costs to live off campus in Westwood, California, as opposed to Knoxville, Tennessee. We are talking about the cash that we actually put in our athletes' hands if they go out to pay their room and board.

[The Council interpretation presented in Proposal No. 132 (Page A-119) was affirmed.]

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. Chair, last night all the delegates agreed that you had handled the sessions yesterday and again today with unique style and wit and wisdom. I think it would be good if the record so reflected, and we could acknowledge that at this time.

[Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged rising ovation to President Witte.]

President Witte: Thank you. I appreciate that very much. Yesterday I recognized the contributions of the people that shared the podium with me. I think the record should also show the wonderful work done by the unsung heroes and heroines of the Voting Committee who counted and recounted and collected far beyond the call of duty. (Applause)

[The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.]

Appendix A

84th Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1989-90 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 84th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 84th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 23	Consent Package
24 through 37	Presidents Commission Grouping
38 through 40	Academics
41 through 51	Financial Aid
52 through 67	Eligibility
68 through 82	General
83 through 89	Amateurism
90 through 103	Playing Seasons
104 through 130	Recruiting

Consent Package

Proposals 1 through 23 are offered as a "consent package" of amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as the package contains certain dominant provisions.

NO. 1 SPORT SPONSORSHIP WAIVER

A. Constitution: Amend 3 2.4.9.4, page 10, as follows.

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2.4.9.4 Male-Female Enrollment Ratio Waiver. The Council,

Legislative Proposals

A-1

by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers to the four-sport sponsorship requirement for men or women if the institution provides data to demonstrate that the male-female enrollment ratio prohibits the offering of the required number of sports for one or the other. The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, and it shall be received in the national office no later than *July* **October** 1. Any request received after that date shall be postmarked no later than *June* **September** 23. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request and shall be signed by the institution's chief executive officer."

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.1, page 283, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.3.1 Waiver of Minimum Women's Sports Sponsorship Criterion. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of the Division I minimum women's sports sponsorship requirement in accordance with the procedures listed below:

"(a) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver, signed by the institution's chief executive officer, to the Association's executive director. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request, and it shall be received in the national office (by mail or wired transmission) not later than *July* **October** 1. Any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than *June* **September** 23."

[20.9.3.1-(b) through 20.9.3.1-(d) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3.3, pages 288-289, as follows:

[Division II only]

"20.10.3.3 Waiver of Minimum Women's Sports Sponsorship Criteria. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of the Division II minimum women's sports sponsorship requirement in accordance with the procedure listed below:

"(a) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver, signed by the institution's chief executive officer, to the Association's executive director. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request, and it shall be received in the national office (by mail or wired transmission) not later than *July* **October** 1. Any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than *June* **September** 23."

[20.10.3.3-(b) through 20.10.3.3-(d) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit member institutions to submit minimum sports sponsorship waiver requests by October 1, rather than the current deadline of July 1.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: All parts approved after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 2 CORRESPONDING MEMBERSHIP

Constitution: Amend 3.5.1, page 14, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.5.1 Eligibility. Corresponding membership is available to duly elected institutions, **nonprofit** organizations, **and** conferences *and individuals* that are not eligible for active, conference or affiliated membership but wish to receive the Association's membership publications and mailings."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To preclude individual applicants and business organizations operating for profit from being eligible for corresponding membership in the NCAA.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 2 through 6, 8 through 11 and 13 through 23 were approved as a consent package.

NO. 3 DETERMINATION OF DUES

Constitution: Amend 3.6.2, page 16, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"3.6.2 Determination of Dues. The annual dues of the various classes of membership shall be recommended to the membership by the Executive Committee. *Such dues are imposed to cover the direct costs of Association publications, Convention operations, establishment and maintenance of playing rules, and compilation of statistics.* Dues shall be established on a two-to-one ratio for Division I in relation to Divisions II and III, for both active members and member conferences."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To delete the list of reasons for which the Association's annual membership dues are imposed.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2

NO. 4 NONCONTROVERSIAL LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend 4.1.3, page 19, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.1.3 Duties and Responsibilities. The Council is empowered to:
[4.1.3-(a) through 4.1.3-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) **Adopt noncontroversial legislative amendments during the interim between annual Conventions, by a three-fourths majority of its members present and**

voting, provided such amendments clearly are necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's legislation, do not involve recruiting or eligibility matters, and are submitted by the Council as legislation at the next annual Convention;"

[4.1.3-(f) and 4.1.3-(g), relettered as 4.1.3-(g) and 4.1.3-(h), unchanged.]

- B. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.1.1 by adding new 5.3.1.1.1, page 32, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.1.1.1 Noncontroversial Amendment. The Council, in the interim between annual Conventions, by a three-fourths majority of its members present and voting, may adopt noncontroversial legislative amendments clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's legislation. The Council shall not adopt recruiting or eligibility legislation pursuant to this provision. The Council shall sponsor legislation at the next annual Convention to confirm the adoption of such amendments."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the Council, in the interim between annual Conventions, to adopt noncontroversial legislative amendments clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's legislation, to specify that such amendments shall not involve recruiting or eligibility matters, and to require the Council to submit legislation at the next annual Convention to confirm the adoption of such amendments.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—CONFERENCE RESTRICTION

Constitution: Amend 4.2.2.2, page 21, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.2.2.2 Conference Restriction. The membership of a 'playing conference' (i.e., one that conducts a regular conference schedule or a postseason meet or tournament to determine its champion in football or basketball) may not be represented on the Executive Committee by more than one individual, excluding the *president and secretary-treasurer* **Association's officers**, except that a man and a woman representing the same playing conference may serve concurrently on the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Intent: To confirm that the Association's officers are exempt from

the limitation on the number of individuals from the same playing conference who may serve on the Executive Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 6 MEMBERSHIP—DISTRICT TRANSFERS

Constitution: Amend 4.7.1.1, page 25, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.7.1.1 District Transfers. *The bylaws may provide for the inclusion of any member in any district other than the one specified above* **Active member institutions may be transferred from their regular geographical districts by majority vote of the delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by majority vote of the Council. An annual listing of the geographical transfers of active members shall appear in the NCAA Directory.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that active member institutions may be transferred from their regular geographical districts by majority vote of the delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by majority vote of the Council and to specify that an annual listing of the geographical transfers of active members shall appear in the NCAA Directory.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 7 ENFORCEMENT—PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE

A. Bylaws: Amend 10.1, page 43, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"10.1 Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or an institutional staff member may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a)** Refusal to furnish information relevant to an investigation of a possible violation of an NCAA regulation when requested to do so by the NCAA or the individual's institution;
- "(b)** Knowing involvement in arranging for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts for a prospective or enrolled student-athlete;
- "(c)** Knowing involvement in offering or providing a prospective or enrolled student-athlete an improper or extra benefit, or
- "(d)** Knowingly furnishing the NCAA or the individual's institution false or misleading information concerning the individual's involvement in or knowledge of **matters relevant to a possible violation of an NCAA regulation.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 10.4, page 44, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"10.4 **Prospective or enrolled** student-athletes found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be ineligible for further intercollegiate competition, subject to appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee for restoration of eligibility. Institutional staff members found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in 19.4.2.1-(f) of the NCAA enforcement procedures, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual's previous employment at another member institution."

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.01.4.3, pages 101-102, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.01.4.3 A **prospective or enrolled** student-athlete who is found to have engaged in unethical conduct shall be ineligible for intercollegiate competition in all sports. Unethical conduct consists of, but is not limited to:

- "(a) Fraudulence in connection with entrance or placement examinations;
- "(b) Engaging in any athletics competition under an assumed name or with intent otherwise to deceive;
- "(c) Dishonesty in evading or violating NCAA regulations, or
- "(d) Knowingly furnishing the NCAA or the individual's institution false or misleading information concerning the student's involvement in or knowledge of **matters relevant to a possible** violation of NCAA regulations. [See 10.1-(d)]"

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To provide that a prospective student-athlete may be found to have engaged in unethical conduct under prescribed conditions and declared ineligible for competition at any member institution, subject to appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee, and to clarify that the provision of false or misleading information to the NCAA or an institution during the course of relevant inquiries into a possible violation is contrary to the NCAA's ethical-conduct legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 8 RECRUITING CONTACTS—POST-HIGH SCHOOL

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4.3, page 81, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.1.4.3 Post-High School Contacts. The contact limitations set forth in this section apply separately to the period in which the prospect is enrolled in high school and the period beginning with the prospect's attendance in a college preparatory school or two-year college

September 1 following the prospect's completion of high school."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To specify that the contact limitations set forth in Bylaw 13.1.4 apply separately in Division II to the period in which a prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning September 1 following the prospect's completion of high school.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 9 OFFICIAL VISITS—AIR TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend 13.5.2.3.3, page 85, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.5.2.3.3 **Charter Noncommercial** Airplane. Whenever an aircraft (other than a commercial airplane or one owned personally by one individual) is used to transport a prospect, payment for its use shall be at the established charter rates at the airport where the craft is based. The institution shall be prepared to demonstrate satisfactorily that such payment has been made."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To stipulate that when a member institution utilizes any aircraft other than commercial airline transportation in conjunction with an official visit, it shall pay the charter rate for the use of such an aircraft.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 10 DEFINITION OF COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.02.3, page 102, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.02.3 Collegiate Institution. A collegiate institution (for purposes of NCAA legislation) is an institution of higher education that:

- "(a) Is listed as a college and coded with an 'H' in the United States Department of Education catalog; or"

[14.02.3-(b) and 14.02.3-(c) unchanged.]

B. Bylaw: Amend 14.2.3.2, page 108, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.2.3.2 Nonrecognized College. Enrollment in a postsecondary, noncollegiate institution (e.g., technical school, seminary or business college) in the United States that is not listed as a college and coded with an 'H' in the United States Department of Education catalog constitutes enrollment in the application of

the five-year/10-semester rule only if."
[14.2.3.2-(a) and 14.2.3.2-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To specify that institutions listed in the United States Department of Education catalog will be considered collegiate institutions (for purposes of NCAA legislation) only if coded with an "H."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 11 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY—ACT TEST SCORES

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 110-111, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"4.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

[14.3.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) A minimum 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections, or a minimum 15 composite score on the ACT of 15 (if taken prior to October 28, 1989) or 18 (if taken on or subsequent to October 28, 1989). The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under normal testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing]."

[14.3.1.1.1 through 14.3.1.1.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a composite score of 18 on the enhanced ACT (which first was administered October 28, 1989) is equivalent to a composite score of 15 on the previous ACT.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 12 CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS—DEADLINE

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1.2 1, page 111, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.1.1.2.1 Core-Curriculum Requirements

"(a) Division I: The time of graduation from high school, unless a student-athlete repeats a regular term or academic year of secondary studies following high-school graduation. In the latter instance, if the core-curriculum requirements are completed during a repeated term, the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment shall not occur until the following academic year."

[14.3.1.1.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a Division I prospective student-athlete may fulfill core-curriculum requirements with courses taken during a repeated regular term or academic year of secondary studies completed following high-school graduation, provided, if the requirement is met during a term (rather than a full academic year), the student does not enroll as a full-time student until the subsequent academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I, as amended by No. 12-1, after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 12-1 CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS—DEADLINE

Amend Proposal No. 12, 14.3.1.1.2.1-(a), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) Division I: The time of graduation from high school, unless a student-athlete repeats a regular term or academic year of secondary studies following high school graduation. In the latter instance, if the core-curriculum requirements are completed during a repeated term, the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment shall not occur until the following academic year, and the core-curriculum courses used to satisfy the requirements of 14.3 must be taken at the high school from which the student graduates."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 13 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.4 by adding new 14.6.4.4.6, page 124, renumbering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.4.4.6 Participation Prior to Certification

"14.6.4.4.6.1 Temporary Certification, Recruited Two-Year College Transfer. If a recruited two-year college transfer reports for athletics participation before the student's high-school or two-year college academic record has been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of two weeks. After this two-week period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a transfer to continue practicing or to compete.

"14.6.4.4.6.2 Temporary Certification, Nonrecruited Two-Year College Transfer. If a nonrecruited two-year college transfer reports for athletics participation be-

fore the student's high-school or two-year college academic record has been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of 45 days. After this period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a transfer to continue practicing or to compete."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To confirm that grace periods for practice exist for two-year college transfers who report for practice before the student's high-school or two-year college academic record has been certified.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 14 INTERNATIONAL-COMPETITION EXEMPTION—FOOTBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.4, page 200, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III
football only, divided vote]

"17.7.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

[17.7.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, and International Competition. One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; international competition approved by the NCAA Council (by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting). **football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution**, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 200-202, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III
football only, divided vote]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) through 17.7.5.2-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) International Game. International competition approved by the Council."

[17.7.5.2-(i) through 17.7.5.2-(m), relettered as 17.7.5.2-(h) through 17.7.5.2-(l), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Com-

mittee).

Intent: To clarify that the international-competition exception in the annual contest exemptions for football relates only to foreign-tour activities, which currently are exempted under other NCAA legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 15 PLAYING SEASONS—DIVISION III FOOTBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.4-(a), page 200, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(a) Spring Practice Scrimmage. One scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided the game is with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both, and"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2-(a), page 200, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(a) Spring Game. One contest at the conclusion of the spring practice period [see 17.7.4-(a)], provided the contest is against a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To confirm that Division III member institutions shall not conduct any spring football contest, scrimmage or practice.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 16 CHAMPIONSHIPS—INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend 18.4.2.1, page 261, as follows.

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.4.2.1 General Institutional Requirements. To be eligible to enter a team or an individual in NCAA championship competition, an institution shall:

[18.4.2.1-(a) through 18.4.2.1-(d) unchanged]

"(e) **Have confirmed annually its sponsorship of a varsity intercollegiate team in the sport by so reporting on the NCAA official information form.**"

[18.4.2.1-(e), renumbered as 18.4.2.1-(f), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that a member institution shall report annually its sponsorship of a varsity intercollegiate team in a sport on the NCAA official information form to be eligible to enter a team or an individual in championship competition in that sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 17 DIVISION MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA WAIVER

Bylaws: Amend 20.3.5.2.4.1, page 278, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.3.5.2.4.1 Maximum Three-Year Waiver Period. If after three years **from the date of election (September 1 following the Convention)** the institution receiving such a waiver has not conformed to all adopted criteria of the division, the institution's membership (or its sport per 20.4):"

[20.3.5.2.4.1-(a) and 20.3.5.2.4.1-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council

Intent: To specify that the maximum three-year period applicable to a waiver of division membership criteria begins on the September 1 following the Convention at which the waiver is approved.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 18 WAIVER—MINIMUM CONTESTS AND PARTICIPANTS

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.3.7.1, page 284, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.3.3.7.1 Minimum Contests and Participants. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers of the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest in situations beyond the control of the institution (*i.e.* **e.g.**, weather conditions or disaster preventing completion of a scheduled competition, or verified injury or illness at the site of competition preventing the participation of the required minimum number of individuals)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3.5.7.1, page 290, as follows:

[Division II only]

"20.10.3.5.7.1 Minimum Contests and Participants. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers of the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest in situations beyond the control of the institution (*i.e.* **e.g.**, weather conditions or disaster preventing completion of a scheduled competition, or verified injury or illness at the site of competition preventing the participation of the required minimum number of individuals)."

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3.2.7.1, page 293, as follows:

A-12 _____ 1990 Convention Proceedings

[Division III only]

"20.11.3.2.7.1 Minimum Contests and Participants. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers of the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest in situations beyond the control of the institution (*i.e.* **e.g.**, weather conditions or disaster preventing completion of a scheduled competition, or verified injury or illness at the site of competition preventing the participation of the required minimum number of individuals)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that the information in the parenthetical phrases within Bylaws 20.9.3.3.7.1, 20.10.3.5.7.1 and 20.11.3.2.7.1 does not constitute an exclusive list of circumstances under which the Council may waive membership requirements related to the minimum numbers of contests and participants.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 19 STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. Bylaws: Amend 21.3.1, page 300, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.1 Method of Selection. The Council shall appoint the general committees of the Association, including the chair of each committee, except the Divisions I, II and III Championships Committees and their chairs shall be appointed by the Executive Committee. Each Council-appointed committee, except the Committee on Infractions, the National Youth Sports Program Committee, and the Committee on Review and Planning, shall include at least one member of the Council, who shall serve as an ex officio committee member and shall be ineligible to serve as chair; **however, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall be chaired by one of its ex officio Council members.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3.23, page 306, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.23 Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

"21.3.23.1 Composition. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of 19 members, including 16 student-athletes, eight from Division I, four from Division II and four from Division III, and including three members of the Council, one from each division. The committee shall be constituted as follows:

[21.3.23.1-(a) and 21.3.23.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The three Council members shall serve as ex officio members of the committee, **and one of the Council members shall serve as chair.**"

Legislative Proposals _____ A-13

[21.3.23.2 and 21.3.23.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To confirm that one of the three Council representatives on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee serves as the chair of that committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 20 WALTER BYERS SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.24, page 306, renumbering subsequent section, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.24 Walter Byers Scholarship Committee

"21.3.24.1 Composition. The Walter Byers Scholarship Committee shall consist of five members, including one position allocated for a man, one allocated for a woman and three unallocated.

"21.3.24.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for planning and administering the Association's Walter Byers Scholarship program for student-athletes who have distinguished themselves academically and athletically."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish the Walter Byers Scholarship Committee as a standing NCAA committee. [Note: Estimated cost to the Association: \$2,000 in 1989-90.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 21 COMMITTEE ON COMPETITIVE SAFEGUARDS AND MEDICAL ASPECTS OF SPORTS

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.8.1, pages 302-303, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.8.1 Composition. The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports shall consist of 15 members, including five positions allocated for men, five allocated for women and five unallocated. The membership of the committee shall be constituted as follows:

[21.3.8.1-(a) through 21.3.8.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) One undergraduate student-athlete member active in sports-medicine research, and"

[Remainder of 21.3.8.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Intent: To specify that the position on the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports previously allocated to an undergraduate student-athlete shall be reallocated to an individual active in sports-medicine research.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 22 INTERPRETATIONS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.14, page 304, as follows.

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.14 Legislation and Interpretations Committee

"21.3.14.1 Composition. The Legislation and Interpretations Committee shall consist of 10 members, including four from Division I and three each from Divisions II and III. Three positions shall be allocated for men, three allocated for women and four unallocated. At least three members of the committee shall be members of the Council.

"21.3.14.2 Duties. The committee shall:

[21.3.14.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Classify all legislation enacted by the Association that amends the constitution or bylaws and accurately incorporate such legislation therein."

[21.3.14.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To change the name of the Legislation and Interpretations Committee to the Interpretations Committee to clarify that the committee's jurisdiction includes interpretive matters, not legislative matters, which are assigned to the Legislative Review Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2.

NO. 23 MEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend 21.6.17, page 311, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.17 Gymnastics Committee, Men's The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members, including at least one representative from each of the four men's gymnastics regions and two representatives elected at large. Four members shall be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II or III and one two members shall be elected at large."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Gymnastics Committee)

Intent: To delete the requirement for Division II or III representation on the Men's Gymnastics Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 2

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following 14 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda. Please note that inclusion of a proposal in this grouping does not constitute a position by the Commission for or against the proposal; rather, the proposals are placed here because the Commission believes that they are of particular interest to chief executive officers. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. Please note also that the Commission has designated all 14 proposals in this grouping for roll-call votes.]

* NO. 24 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISIONS I AND II

A. Bylaws: Amend 13 by adding new 13.3, page 83, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"13.3 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION DATA

"13.3.1 Disclosure Report—Divisions I and II

"13.3.1.1 Report Publication. The Association's national office annually shall publish the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in 30.1 and shall identify the information on an institution-specific basis.

"13.3.1.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to prospects, to prospects' parents, and to the prospects' high school and two-year college coaches the information contained within the report. The information shall be provided upon request and at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than the day prior to a prospect's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.2.2, page 262, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"18.4.2.2 Division I Championships. To be eligible to enter a team or an individual in an NCAA championship, a Division I member institution also shall:

[18.4.2.2-(a) and 18.4.2.2-(b) unchanged; 18.4.2.2-(c) deleted]

"(c) Report annually to the NCAA through the chief executive officer, on a form approved by the Council, the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in 30.1. The data shall be received in the national office not later than October 1. Any data received after that date shall appear on a form postmarked not later than September 23."

[Remainder of 18.4.2.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.2.3, page 262, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"18.4.2.3 Division II Championships. To be eligible to enter a team or an individual in an NCAA championship, a Division II member institution shall, in addition to meeting the general institutional eligibility requirements set forth in 18.4.2.1:

[18.4.2.3-(a) and 18.4.2.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Report annually to the NCAA through the chief executive officer, on a form approved by the Council, the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in 30.1. The data shall be received in the national office not later than October 1. Any data received after that date shall appear on a form postmarked not later than September 23."

D. Bylaws: Amend 30 by deleting 30.1, substituting new 30.1, pages 315-316, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"30.1 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISIONS I AND II

"A Division I or II institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or an individual competitor in an NCAA championship unless its chief executive officer provides in an annual report, on a form approved by the Council, the admissions and graduation-rate information specified in this section. The data shall be received in the national office not later than October 1. Any data received after that date shall appear on a form postmarked not later than September 23. (See 13.3, 18.4.2.2 and 18.4.2.3 for additional regulations.)

"30.1.1 Report Information. The information specified below shall be included in the report.

"30.1.1.1 Admissions Requirements and Data. The report shall include a statement of the institution's regular, published entrance requirements for admission of regularly matriculated, degree-seeking students as soon as such information is available following the initiation of the academic year (i.e., excluding the most recent academic year preceding the October 1 deadline), including:

"(a) Any authority for the acceptance of students who could not be enrolled in the institution if special action is not taken on their admissions applications;

"(b) The total number of entering recruited student-athletes;

- "(c) The number of entering recruited student-athletes accepted under the special authority;
- "(d) The total number of entering students, and
- "(e) The number of entering students accepted under the special authority.

"30.1.1.2 Individual Student-Athlete Data. The report shall include the following information for each entering recruited student-athlete (listed individually, but anonymously):

- "(a) The student's specific high school grade-point average utilized to meet the 'qualifier' definition set forth in 14.02.9.1 and the 'partial qualifier' definition set forth in 14.02.9.2;
- "(b) The student's score(s) on the ACT or SAT;
- "(c) An indication of whether the student was a regular or special admittee, and
- "(d) The specific school, college or department of the institution to which the student was admitted.

"30.1.1.3 Academic Progress of Student-Athletes. The report shall include (for the academic year that began two years before) the total number of student-athletes in each sport who represented the institution in intercollegiate competition. Of that number, the report also shall specify the number who:

- "(a) Graduated;
- "(b) Left the institution in good academic standing, having met the satisfactory-progress requirements for eligibility if the student had returned for the following academic year;
- "(c) Left the institution not in good academic standing, or did not meet the satisfactory-progress requirements for eligibility if the student had returned for the following academic year;
- "(d) Returned to the institution in good academic standing and met the satisfactory-progress requirements for continuing eligibility, or
- "(e) Returned to the institution not in good academic standing or did not meet the satisfactory-progress requirements for continuing eligibility.

"30.1.1.4 Graduation Rates. The report shall include the following defined and undefined institutional graduation rates, as those terms are defined in 30.1.1.5, based upon the number of students who entered the institution with no previ-

ous, full-time collegiate attendance:

- "(a) The average graduation rate for all students for the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available (i.e., excluding the most recent academic year preceding the October 1 deadline), based upon a five-year period in which to graduate;
- "(b) The average graduation rate for recruited student-athletes for the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available (i.e., excluding the most recent academic year preceding the October 1 deadline), reported separately for each sport and reported by race in football, men's basketball and women's basketball, and collectively in all other men's sports and women's sports, based upon a five-year period in which to graduate;
- "(c) The average time spent to graduate by all graduating students and the average time spent to graduate by all graduating recruited student-athletes, each average based upon the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available, and
- "(d) The average undefined graduation rate for recruited student-athletes who have exhausted their athletics eligibility for the 10 most recent calendar years (excluding the academic years preceding the October 1 deadline for which such information is not available) without limitation on the period of time in which to graduate.

"30.1.1.5 Defined and Undefined Graduation Rates. In calculating the defined graduation rate, transfer student-athletes shall be included as a part of the class that had completed degree credit equivalent to the degree credit completed by the transfer student-athletes and accepted by the certifying institution at the time of transfer; a student-athlete who left the institution while in good academic standing and who would have met the satisfactory-progress requirements for athletics eligibility if the student-athlete had returned for the following academic term shall not be included, and student-athletes who did not graduate within the specified five-year period but who continue to be enrolled as full-time students at the same institution and maintain satisfactory progress toward a specific baccalaureate degree also shall not be included. In calculating the

undefined graduation rate, none of the foregoing adjustments shall be made, and the graduation rate shall consist simply of the number of entering students or recruited student-athletes who graduated within the period specified in 30.1.1.4.

"30.1.1.6 Specific Degree Programs. The report shall identify the specific baccalaureate degree programs of studies pursued by the student-athletes included in the defined graduation-rate information specified in 30.1.1.5 who graduated and shall indicate the number who obtained a degree in each of those programs."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To require Divisions I and II member institutions to provide admissions and graduation-rate data to prospects, the parents of prospects, and prospects' high school and two-year college coaches; to require that the Association publish such information annually on an institution-specific basis, and to establish the report of such information to the NCAA as a prerequisite for Divisions I and II championships eligibility. [Estimated annual cost to the Association and its member institutions: Unknown.]

Effective Date: Member institutions to begin compiling data immediately; first report using the rolling five-year average to NCAA by Division I institutions due October 1, 1991; first report using the rolling five-year average to NCAA by Division II institutions due October 1, 1994.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 24-3. Part A approved by Division I, 323-3, and by Division II, 166-7, roll-call votes. Part B approved by Division I, 322-2, roll-call vote. Part C approved by Division II, 175-6, one abstention, roll-call vote. Part D approved as amended by No. 24-3; Division I, 320-4, and Division II, 178-6, both roll-call votes. Motion to refer Part D to NCAA Council defeated by Division I (20-305) and by Division II (11-169), both roll-call votes.

NO. 24-1 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISION I

Amend Proposal No. 24-B, 18.4.2.2-(c), as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"(c) Report annually to the NCAA through the chief executive officer, on a form provided by the Council, the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in 30.1. The data shall be received in the national office not later than **October 1 November 1**. Any data received after that date shall appear on a form postmarked not later than **September 23 October 23**."

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 24-2 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISIONS I AND II

Amend Proposal No. 24-D by adding new 30.1.1.1-(f) and deleting 30.1.1.2-(b), relettering subsequent subsections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"(f) The low, high and average ACT and SAT scores achieved by all members of the most recent entering class for which such information is available (i.e., excluding the class entering immediately prior to the October 1 deadline), and the low, high and average ACT scores achieved by all recruited student-athletes who were members of that class."

Source: Georgetown University.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 24-3 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISIONS I AND II

Amend Proposal No. 24-D, 30.1.1.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"30.1.1.2 Individual Student-Athlete Average Admissions Data. The report shall include the following information for each entering recruited student-athletes, *(listed individually but anonymously)* reported as averages separately for football, men's basketball, women's basketball, and collectively in all other men's sports and women's sports:

"(a) The student's specific average high school grade-point average utilized to meet the 'qualifier' definition set forth in 14.02 9.1 and the 'partial qualifier' definition set forth in 14.02 9.2;

"(b) The student's average score(s) on the ACT or SAT;

"(c) An indication of whether the **The percentage of students who** was a **were** regular or special admittees, and

"(d) The **number admitted to each** specific school, college or department of the institution to which the student was admitted."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I (311-9) and Division II (173-6), roll-call votes.

NO. 24-4 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISIONS I AND II

Amend Proposal No. 24-D, 30.1.1.4-(b), as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"(b) The average graduation rate for recruited student-athletes for the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available (i.e., excluding the most recent aca-

demic year preceding the October 1 deadline), reported separately for each sport and reported by race in football, men's basketball and women's basketball, and collectively in all other men's sports and women's sports, based upon a five-year period in which to graduate;"

Source: Georgetown University.

Action: Defeated by Division I (80-243) and Division II (43-136). roll-call votes.

NO. 25 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISION III

A. Bylaws: Amend 13 by adding new 13.3, page 83, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"13.3 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION DATA

"13.3.1 Disclosure Report—Division III

"13.3.1.1 Report Publication. The Association's national office annually shall publish the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in 30.1 and shall identify the information on an institution-specific basis.

"13.3.1.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to prospects, to prospects' parents, and to the prospects' high school and two-year college coaches the information contained within the report. The information shall be provided upon request and at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process, provided the institution supplies such information to prospective students generally; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than the prospect's official acceptance for enrollment at the institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.2 by adding new 18.4.2.4, page 263, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"18.4.2.4 Division III Championships. To be eligible to enter a team or an individual in an NCAA championship, a Division III member institution also shall report annually to the NCAA through the chief executive officer, on a form approved by the Council, the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in 30.1. The data shall be received in the national office not later than October 1. Any data received after that date shall appear on a form postmarked not later than September 23."

C. Bylaws: Amend 30 by adding new 30.1, pages 315-316, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"30.1 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION-RATE DISCLOSURE—DIVISION III

"A Division III institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or an individual competitor in an NCAA championship unless its chief executive officer provides in an annual report, on a form approved by the Council, the admissions and graduation-rate information specified in this section. The data shall be received in the national office not later than October 1. Any data received after that date shall appear on a form postmarked not later than September 23. (See 13.3 and 18.4.2.4 for additional regulations.)

"30.1.1 Report Information. The information specified below shall be included in the report.

"30.1.1.1 Admissions Requirements and Data. The report shall include a statement of the institution's regular, published entrance requirements for admission of regularly matriculated, degree-seeking students as soon as such information is available following the initiation of the academic year (i.e., excluding the most recent academic year preceding the October 1 deadline), including:

"(a) Any authority for the acceptance of students who could not be enrolled in the institution if special action is not taken on their admissions applications;

"(b) The total number of entering students who completed a full season of participation in a varsity sport;

"(c) The number of entering students who completed a full season of participation in a varsity sport who were accepted under the special authority;

"(d) The total number of entering students, and

"(e) The number of entering students accepted under the special authority.

"30.1.1.2 Individual Student-Athlete Data. The report shall include the following information for each entering student who completed a full season of participation in a varsity sport (listed individually, but anonymously):

"(a) An indication of whether the student was a regular or special admittee, and

"(b) The specific school, college or department of the institution to which the student was admitted.

"30.1.1.3 Academic Progress of Student-Athletes.

The report shall include (for the academic year that began two years before) the total number of student-athletes in each sport who represented the institution in intercollegiate competition. Of that number, the report also shall specify the number who:

- "(a) Graduated;
- "(b) Left the institution in good academic standing;
- "(c) Left the institution not in good academic standing;
- "(d) Returned to the institution in good academic standing, or
- "(e) Returned to the institution not in good academic standing.

"30.1.1.4 Graduation Rates. The report shall include the following defined and undefined institutional graduation rates, as those terms are defined in 30.1.1.5, based upon the number of students who entered the institution with no previous, full-time collegiate attendance:

- "(a) The average graduation rate for all students for the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available (i.e., excluding the most recent academic year preceding the October 1 deadline), based upon a five-year period in which to graduate;
- "(b) The average graduation rate for recruited students who completed a full season of participation in a varsity sport for the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available (i.e., excluding the most recent academic year preceding the October 1 deadline), reported separately for each sport and reported by race in football, men's basketball and women's basketball, and collectively in all other men's sports and women's sports, based upon a five-year period in which to graduate;
- "(c) The average time spent to graduate by all graduating students and the average time spent to graduate by all graduating students who completed a full season of participation in a varsity sport, each average based upon the four most recent graduating classes for which such information is available, and
- "(d) The average undefined graduation rate for students who completed a full season of participation in a varsity sport and have exhaust-

ed their athletics eligibility for the 10 most recent calendar years (excluding any academic years preceding the October 1 deadline for which such information is not available) without limitation on the period of time in which to graduate.

"30.1.1.5 Defined and Undefined Graduation Rates. In calculating the defined graduation rate, transfer student-athletes shall be included as a part of the class that had completed degree credit equivalent to the degree credit completed by the transfer student-athletes and accepted by the certifying institution at the time of transfer; a student-athlete who left the institution while in good academic standing and who would have met the satisfactory-progress requirements for athletics eligibility if the student-athlete had returned for the following academic term shall not be included, and student-athletes who did not graduate within the specified five-year period but who continue to be enrolled as full-time students at the same institution and maintain satisfactory progress toward a specific baccalaureate degree also shall not be included. In calculating the undefined graduation rate, none of the foregoing adjustments shall be made, and the graduation rate shall consist simply of the number of entering students or recruited student-athletes who graduated within the period specified in 30.1.1.4.

"30.1.1.6 Specific Degree Programs. The report shall identify the specific baccalaureate degree programs of studies pursued by the student-athletes included in the defined graduation-rate information specified in 30.1.1.5 who graduated and shall indicate the number who obtained a degree in each of those programs."

Source: NCAA Division III Steering Committee.

Intent: To require Division III member institutions to provide admissions and graduation-rate data to prospects, the parents of prospects, and prospects' high school and two-year college coaches; to require that the Association publish such information annually on an institution-specific basis, and to establish the report of such information to the NCAA as a prerequisite for Division III championships eligibility. [Estimated annual cost to the Association and its member institutions: Unknown.]

Effective Date: Member institutions to begin compiling data immediately; first report using the rolling five-year average to NCAA due October 1, 1994.

Action: Withdrawn.

* **NO. 26 PARTIAL QUALIFIER—DIVISION I**

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.2, page 113, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.2 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier

"14.3.2.1 Partial Qualifier—Division I. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a Division I institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.2) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.3.1 and 15.5.1.2.2) based on financial need only, consistent with institutional and conference regulations, but may not practice or compete during the first academic year in residence.

"14.3.2.2 Partial Qualifier—Division II. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a Division I or Division II institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.2) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.3.1) based on institutional and conference regulations but may not practice or compete during the first academic year in residence."

[Remainder of 14.3.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.1.2 by adding new 15.5.1.2.2, page 146, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football or Basketball—Partial Qualifier. In Division I football or basketball, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier (as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To rescind the adoption of 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 by retaining the partial qualifier in Division I and permitting a partial qualifier to receive institutional financial aid based on demonstrated financial need, and to specify that in the sports of football and basketball, a partial qualifier who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives such need-based financial aid shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations for the applicable sport.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 26—3 Final vote was 258-66, with one abstention, roll call. Order of Proposal Nos 26, 27 and 28 originally was changed by vote of the delegates in the opening business session. In the Division I business session, a motion to reinstate the order as printed was approved, 215-89.

NO. 26—1 PARTIAL QUALIFIER—DIVISION I

Amend Proposal No. 26-B, 15.5.1.2.2, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football or Basketball—Partial Qualifier. In Division I football or basketball, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier (as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw if the prospect received an official (paid) visit from the institution or if the prospect was visited at the prospect's home by a member of the institution's coaching staff."

Source: NCAA Council (Presidents Commission)

Action: Defeated by Division I, 107-208, one abstention, roll call.
Later motion to reconsider defeated by Division I, 142-179, roll call.

NO. 26—2 PARTIAL QUALIFIER—DIVISION I

Amend Proposal No. 26-B, 15.5.1.2.2, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football or Basketball—Partial Qualifier. In Division I football or basketball, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier (as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited and received a written offer of athletically related financial assistance by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw."

Source: All eight members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 26—3 PARTIAL QUALIFIER—DIVISION I

Amend Proposal No. 26-B, 15.5.1.2.2, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football or Basketball—Partial Qualifier. In Division I football or basketball, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier (as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw when the student-athlete participates in an institutional practice session or represents the institution against outside competition."

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I, 189-136, one abstention, roll call. First defeated, 158-162, three abstentions, roll call; motion to reconsider passed, 192-133.

NO. 27 PARTIAL QUALIFIER—DIVISION I

Bylaws: Amend 14.02.9 through 14.3.4, pages 103-114, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.02.9 Qualification Status

[14.02.9.1 unchanged.]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier—Division II Only. A partial qualifier is a student in Division II who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.000 (based on a 4.000 scale).

"14.02.9.3 Nonqualifier. In Division I, a nonqualifier is a student who has not met the requirements for a qualifier at the time specified in the regulation [see 14.3.1.1.2.1-(a) and 14.3.1.1.2.2-(a)]. In Division II, a nonqualifier is a student who has not graduated from high school or who, at the time specified in the regulation [see 14.3.1.1.2.1-(b) and 14.3.1.1.2.2-(b)], failed to achieve either the core-curriculum grade-point average and the SAT/ACT score required for a qualifier or the minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 required for a partial qualifier.

[Remainder of 14.02 and 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3.1 unchanged.]

"14.3.2 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier.

"14.3.2.1 Partial Qualifier—Division II. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a **Division I or Division II** institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.2) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.3.1) based on institutional and conference regulations but may not practice or compete during the first academic year in residence.

[14.3.2.2 and 14.3.2.3 unchanged.]

"14.3.2.4 Outside Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier. A nonqualifier in Division I or II or a partial qualifier in Division II or nonqualifier may participate in the institution's intramural program (provided the intramural team is not coached by a member of the institution's athletics department staff), but during the first year of enrollment such an individual is not permitted to participate in athletics competition on an institutional club team or on an outside sports team.

"14.3.3 Seasons of Eligibility—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier. Partial qualifiers (Division II only) and nonqualifiers, recruited or nonrecruited, shall be permitted to have years of eligibility subsequent to the first year of residence at the certifying institution as follows:

"(a) Division I: three years (nonqualifier).

"(b) Division II: four years (partial qualifier or nonqualifier).

"14.3.4 Residence Requirement—Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A partial qualifier in Division II must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice and competition. A nonqualifier in Divisions I and II must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice, competition and athletically related financial aid. The requirements that must be met to fulfill an academic year of residence are set forth in 14.6.1.1"

Source: All nine members of the Big East Conference and all eight members of the Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Intent: To rescind the passage of 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 and reestablish the partial qualifier in Division I.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 92-228, five abstentions, roll call, after motion to sustain the chair's ruling that adoption of No. 26 would make Nos. 27 and 28 moot was defeated.

NO. 28 PARTIAL QUALIFIER—DIVISION I

A. Bylaws: Amend 14, pages 101-132, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

[14.01 and 14.02.1 through 14.02.8 unchanged]

"14.02.9 Qualification Status

[14.02.9.1 unchanged.]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier—Division II Only. A partial qualifier is a student in Division II who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.000 (based on a 4.000 scale).

"14.02.9.3 Nonqualifier. In Division I, a nonqualifier is a student who has not met the requirements for a qualifier at the time specified in the regulation [see 14.3.1.1.2.1-(a) and 14.3.1.1.2.2-(a)]. In Division II, a nonqualifier is a student who has not graduated from high school or who, at the time specified in the regulation [see 14.3.1.1.2.1-(b) and 14.3.1.1.2.2-(b)], failed to achieve either the core-curriculum grade-point average and the SAT/ACT score required for a qualifier or the minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 required for a partial qualifier.

[14.02.10 through 14.02.12, 14.1 and 14.2 unchanged.]

"14.3 FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS, DIVISIONS I AND II

"14.3.2 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier.

"14.3.2.1 Partial Qualifier—Division II. An entering fresh-

man with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a Division I or Division II institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.2) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.3.1) based on institutional and conference regulations but may not practice or compete during the first academic year in residence.

[14.3.2.2 and 14.3.2.3 unchanged.]

"14.3.2.4 Outside Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier. A *partial qualifier or nonqualifier in Division I or II or a partial qualifier in Division II* may participate in the institution's intramural program (provided the intramural team is not coached by a member of the institution's athletics department staff), but during the first year of enrollment such an individual is not permitted to participate in athletics competition on an institutional club team or an outside sports team.

"14.3.3 Seasons of Eligibility—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier. Partial qualifiers (**Division II only**) and nonqualifiers, recruited or nonrecruited, shall be permitted to have years of eligibility subsequent to the first year of residence at the certifying institution as follows:

"(a) Division I: three years (**nonqualifier**).

"(b) Division II: four years (**partial qualifier or nonqualifier**)

"14.3.4 Residence Requirement—Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A partial qualifier in **Division II** must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice and competition. A nonqualifier in **Divisions I and II** must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice, competition and athletically related financial aid. The requirements that must be met to fulfill an academic year of residence are set forth in 14.6.1.1."

[14.3.5 and 14.4 through 14.14 unchanged.]

B. Resolution:

[Division I only, roll call]

"Whereas, 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 eliminated the opportunity for a 'partial qualifier' (as defined in 14.02.9.2) to receive institutional financial assistance during the first year of full-time collegiate enrollment; and

"Whereas, it appears that some of the voting delegates who supported Proposal No. 42 did not appreciate fully the prohibitive effect that the adoption of the proposal would have on the opportunity of a partial qualifier to receive institutional financial assistance unrelated to athletics; and

"Whereas, the Association's initial-eligibility legislation affects a wide range of academic, athletics and socioeconomic concerns, many of which have been articulated only recently, and the potential effects of this legislation remain unclear; and

"Whereas, the effective date of Proposal No. 42, as adopted, will

precede the completion of the Association's study of the academic performance of student-athletes, which places special emphasis on the effect of the Association's initial-eligibility legislation;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Academic Requirements Committee, Council and Presidents Commission study further the various concerns related to the adoption of Proposal No. 42, including additional information related to the graduation rates of partial qualifiers and other student-athletes contained in the study of the academic performance of student-athletes and similar information submitted by member institutions and other interested parties, and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Academic Requirements Committee, Council and Presidents Commission report their findings to the membership, including related legislation, if appropriate, prior to the 1991 NCAA Convention."

Source: All nine members of the Big East Conference.

Intent: To delay until August 1991 the effective date for 1989 Convention Proposal No. 42 (i.e., the elimination of the "partial qualifier" provision applicable to Division I member institutions), and to direct the Academic Requirements Committee, Council and Presidents Commission to study this issue further, including a review of the Association's study of the academic performance of student-athletes, and report their findings to the membership, including related legislation, if appropriate, prior to the 1991 Convention.

Effective Date: Part A effective August 1, 1991. Part B effective immediately.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 26. Chair ruled that delegates' action in approving No. 26 and defeating No. 27 made No. 28 moot. Motion to sustain the ruling of the chair was approved.

NO. 29 RECEIPT OF NONATHLETICS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE—NONQUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.2, 14.3.3 and 14.3.4, pages 113-114, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"14.3.2 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier.

[14.3.2.1 unchanged.]

"14.3.2.2 Nonqualifier. *Nonrecruited*. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who is not a qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.1) at the time of enrollment in a Division I or Division II institution shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence. However, such a student in a **Division II institution** who was not recruited (per 13.02.8) and for whom admission and financial aid were granted without regard to athletics ability shall be eligible for nonathletics institutional financial aid, provided there is on file in the of-

fice of the athletics director certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were **was** so granted.

[Remainder of 14.3.2 and 14.3.3 unchanged.]

"14.3.4 Residence Requirement—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier A partial qualifier must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice and competition. A nonqualifier must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice, competition and *athletically related* financial aid **other than that permitted per 14.3.2.2.** The requirements that must be met to fulfill an academic year of residence are set forth in 14.6.1.1."

Source: NCAA Division II Steering Committee (Special Council Subcommittee to Review 1989 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 42).

Intent: To specify that all Division II student-athletes who are not qualifiers shall be eligible to receive institutional financial aid awarded without regard to athletics ability if there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative and the chair of the financial aid committee that the student's financial aid was awarded without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division II, 153-11, roll-call vote

* NO. 30 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

A. Resolution:

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the NCAA Presidents Commission has reviewed the data in the studies conducted for the Commission by the American Institutes for Research as specified in the Commission document entitled 'Agenda for Reform,' which resulted in the 18-month National Forum on the proper role of intercollegiate athletics within higher education; and

"Whereas, the studies found that the time demands encountered by student-athletes as a direct result of their participation in football and basketball exceeded the time spent by those student-athletes in preparing for and attending classes; and

"Whereas, the Commission believes that the data on time demands indicate an inordinate amount of time being devoted to activities related to athletics participation, especially in view of the Commission's belief that the data appear to be extremely conservative; and

"Whereas, it is clear from the data that the time demands of athletics-related activities, coupled often with inadequate academic preparation, may impact adversely on the academic progress of student-athletes, especially football and basketball players; and

"Whereas, the Commission believes that there must be restraints on these time demands to reduce the amount of time and pressure faced by student-athletes and to begin to address the problems in academics and socialization reflected in the studies; and

"Whereas, the Commission believes that the AIR studies clearly call for reduction of time demands in football and basketball, and the Commission is proposing the first steps in those sports in the remaining parts of this legislative proposal; and

"Whereas, the AIR studies grouped all other sports, and those aggregate data did not suggest specific sport-by-sport reductions that would be appropriate in all other sports;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that this Convention direct the appropriate athletics interest groups (e.g., athletics administrators, coaches, NCAA governing sports committees) to develop recommendations to reduce the time demands encountered by student-athletes in all sports other than football and basketball, with those recommendations to be presented to the Commission and to the NCAA Council not later than April 1, 1990, and

"Be It Further Resolved, that legislation to reduce the time demands in all sports other than football and basketball be sponsored by the Council or the Commission for action at the January 1991 NCAA Convention."

Action: Approved, 710-33, roll-call vote.

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 202, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football only, divided vote, roll call]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice—Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II, 20 10 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 36 18 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 15 of the 20 sessions may involve contact **Contact during such sessions is prohibited.**"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA as amended by No. 30—4; moot for Division II due to approval of No. 31. Division I-A vote was 109-6; Division I-AA, 89-6, one abstention, roll-call vote. Motion to refer 30-B to Council defeated by Division I-A, 10-104, and Division I-AA, 4-89, one abstention, roll-call vote.

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 182, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and III, divided vote, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to

October 15 **November 1.**

"17.3.2.1.1 Permissible Conditioning Activities. Team conditioning or physical-fitness activities supervised by coaching staff members may be conducted on or off court but shall not begin prior to the first day of classes of the academic year or September **October 1**, whichever date occurs earlier.

"17.3.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to **October 15 November 1**, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:"

[Remainder of 17.3.2.1.2 unchanged.]

Action: Nos. 30-C and 30-E approved by Division I, 255-63; No. 30-C approved by Division III, 206-24, roll-call vote. Motion to refer 30-C and 30-E for Division I defeated, 107-218, roll-call vote.

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 182, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to **October 15 November 1.**

"17.3.2.1.1 Permissible Conditioning Activities. Team conditioning or physical-fitness activities supervised by coaching staff members may be conducted on or off court but shall not begin prior to the first day of classes of the academic year or September 1 **October 15**, whichever date occurs earlier.

"17.3.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to **October 15 November 1**, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:"

[Remainder of 17.3.2.1.2 unchanged.]

Action: Approved by Division II (153-20), as amended by No. 30-6, roll-call vote.

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3, page 183, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.3.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.3.3.1.

"(a) Division I—The fourth Friday in November **December 1**

"17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.3.3

[17.3.3.1-(a) and 17.3.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) ABAUSA, Tip-Off Classic, Foreign-Team Games. The following basketball games may be played after November 1 **15**, subject to the exemption set forth in 17.3.5.3:

[Remainder of 17.3.3.1-(c) and 17.3.3.1-(d) unchanged.]

Action: See No. 30-C.

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3, page 183, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.3.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.3.3.1:

[17.3.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Divisions II and III—The Friday immediately preceding Thanksgiving.

"(c) **Division III—December 1.**

"17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.3.3:

[17.3.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Practice Scrimmages—Division III. A maximum of two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition (conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring) may be conducted between **October 15 November 1** and the conclusion of the basketball season. Such scrimmages need not be counted against the maximum permissible number of contests;

"(c) ABAUSA, Tip-Off Classic, Foreign-Team Games. The following basketball games may be played after November 1 **15**, subject to the exemptions set forth in 17.3.5.3:"

[Remainder of 17.3.3.1-(c) and 17.3.3.1-(d) unchanged.]

Action: Defeated by Division III, 11-129.

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5, pages 183-186, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"17.3.5 Number of Contests

"17.3.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of basketball in any one year to the following number of contests (games or scrimmages) except for those contests excluded under 17.3.5.2, 17.3.5.3 and 17.3.5.4:

"(a) Divisions I and, II and III—**28 25.**

"(b) Division III—**26**

[17.3.5.1.1 and 17.3.5.1.2 unchanged.]

"17.3.5.1.3 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than **28 25** basketball contests in Divisions I and II or not more than **26** basketball contests in Division III. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.7, including competition as a member of the varsity

ty, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution. Further, an individual student-athlete may participate each year in only one postseason basketball tournament as a member of the institution's varsity, junior varsity or freshman team.

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) and 17.3.5.2-(b) unchanged; remainder of 17.3.5.2 and 17.3.5.3 deleted.]

"17.3.5.4 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions

"17.3.5.4.1 Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:"

[17.3.5.4.1-(a) unchanged; remainder of 17.3.5.4.1 deleted; 17.3.5.4.2 unchanged; 17.3.5.4.3 deleted; 17.3.5.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To reduce the time demands required of student-athletes in all sports; specifically (1) by reducing spring football practice in Divisions I-A, I-AA and II to 10 sessions during 18 consecutive calendar days and to prohibit contact during those practice sessions; (2) by specifying that men's and women's basketball practice shall not begin until November 1 in all divisions; (3) by specifying that preseason conditioning activities in the sport of basketball may not begin before October 1 in Divisions I and III and October 15 in Division II; (4) by specifying that the first basketball contest shall not occur until December 1 in Divisions I and III; (5) by reducing to 25 the number of permissible contests in all divisions; (6) by eliminating the current exemptions to counting basketball contests in all divisions, except for those related to a conference season-end basketball tournament, one postseason basketball tournament, a conference play-off and a certified foreign tour, and (7) by directing athletics interests in all sports other than football and basketball to develop recommendations for reductions in the time demands encountered by student-athletes in all sports for action at the 1991 annual Convention.

Effective Date: Part A effective immediately. Part B effective August 1, 1990. Parts C through G effective August 1, 1992.

Action: No. 30-G approved by all divisions as amended by No. 30-11 in Divisions I and II, unamended in Division III. Division I vote was 206-116; Division II vote was 112-55, two abstentions; Division III vote was 213-25, all roll-call votes. Motion to refer 30-G was first approved by Division I, 170-150, one abstention; later motion to reconsider was approved, 165-156, one abstention, and motion to refer then was defeated, 147-177, one abstention, roll-call votes.

No. 30 approved by all divisions as amended by Nos. 30-4

(Divisions I-A and I-AA), 30-6 (Division II) and 30-11 (Divisions I and II). Actions did not occur in the printed order in the Convention publications due to successful motions to change the order, as well as other parliamentary maneuvers (See each part for specific action.) A motion to refer all parts of 30 for Division I was ruled out of order. A motion to reconsider all of Proposal No. 30, as amended, was defeated in all divisions (102-217, three abstentions, in Division I; 19-154 in Division II; 9-125 in Division III, roll-call votes).

NO. 30-1 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 30-A, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the NCAA Presidents Commission has reviewed the data in the studies conducted for the Commission by the American Institutes for Research as specified in the Commission document entitled 'Agenda for Reform,' which resulted in the 18-month National Forum on the proper role of intercollegiate athletics within higher education; and

"Whereas, the studies found that the time demands encountered by student-athletes as a direct result of their participation in football and basketball exceeded the time spent by those student-athletes in preparing for and attending classes, and

"Whereas, the Commission believes that the data on time demands encountered by student-athletes as a direct result of their participation in intercollegiate athletics indicate an inordinate amount of time being devoted to activities related to athletics participation, especially in view of the Commission's belief that the data appear to be extremely conservative; and

"Whereas, it is clear from the data that the time demands of athletics-related activities, coupled with inadequate academic preparation, may impact adversely on the academic progress of student-athletes, especially football and basketball players; and

"Whereas, the Commission believes that there must be restraints on these time demands to reduce the amount of time and pressure faced by student-athletes to begin to address the problems in academics and socialization reflected in the studies; and

"Whereas, the Commission believes that the AIR studies clearly call for a reduction of time demands in football and basketball intercollegiate athletics activities and the Commission is proposing the first steps in those sports in the remaining parts of this legislative proposal; and

"Whereas, the AIR studies grouped all other sports, and those aggregate data did not suggest specific sport by sport reductions that would be appropriate in all other sports.

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that this Convention direct the appropriate athletics interest groups (e.g., athletics administrators, coaches, NCAA governing sports committees) to develop recommendations to reduce the time demands encountered by student-athletes in all sports other than football and basketball, with those recommendations to be presented to the Commission and to the NCAA Council not later than April July 1, 1990; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the legislation to reduce the time demands in all sports other than football and basketball be sponsored by the Council or the Commission for action at the January 1991 NCAA Convention."

Source: All eight members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Action: Defeated, 363-383, roll-call vote.

NO. 30—2 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 30-B, 17.7.6, as follows:

[Division II football only, roll call]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice—Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II, 10 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 18 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Contact during such sessions is prohibited;

"(b) Spring Practice—Division II. In Division II, 12 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 24 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar. Contact during such sessions is prohibited and practice sessions (including meetings) are limited to a maximum of two hours per day;"

[17.7.6-(b) through 17.7.6-(e), relettered as 17.7.6-(c) through 17.7.6-(f), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Steering Committee.

Action: Moot due to Division II approval of No. 31

NO. 30—4 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 30-B, 17.7.6-(a), as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football only, divided vote, roll call]

"(a) Spring Practice—Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II 10 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 18 21 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Contact during such sessions is prohibited. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact."

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Berkeley; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; University of Washington, and one other member of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I-A, 81-28, one abstention, and Division I-AA, 52-33, three abstentions, roll-call votes.

NO. 30—6 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 30-D, 17.3.2.1.1, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"17.3.2.1.1 Permissible Conditioning Activities. Team conditioning or physical-fitness activities supervised by coaching staff members may be conducted on or off court but shall not begin prior to October 15 1."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Action: Approved by Division II, 156-16, roll-call vote.

NO. 30—7 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 30-G, 17.3.5.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"17.3.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of basketball in any one year to the following number of contests (games or scrimmages).

"(a) Divisions I, and II and III—25 28

"(b) Division III—26.

[17.3.5.1.1 and 17.3.5.1.2 unchanged.]

"[17.3.5.1.3 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than 25 28 basketball contests in Divisions I and II or not more than 26 basketball contests in Division III. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.7, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution. Further, an individual student-athlete may participate each year in only one postseason basketball tournament as a member of the institution's varsity, junior varsity or freshman team."

Source: Marquette University.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 152-168, roll-call vote.

NO. 30—11 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

A Amend Proposal No. 30-G, 17.3.5.4, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.3.5.4 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions

[17.3.5.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"17.3.5.4.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

"(a) Hawaii or Alaska Contests. Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Alaska or Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), by a member institution located outside the area in question, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Alaska or Hawaii;

"(b) Puerto Rico or Preseason National Invitation Tournament. Those contests permitted in one of the following:

"(1) Puerto Rico—Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Puerto Rico) or one tournament (not to exceed four contests) by a member institution located outside of Puerto Rico, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Puerto Rico, or

"(2) Preseason National Invitation Tournament. The games played in the preseason National Invitation Tournament.

"(c) One contest against a foreign team in the United States;

"(d) ABAUSA Club. The one basketball game against a 'club' member of the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States of America, or

"(e) Tip-Off Classic. The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic.

"17.3.5.4.3 Conference Exception. The limitations under 17.3.5.4.2-(a) and (b) shall not apply to regular-season contests between two members of the same NCAA conference."

B. Amend Proposal No. 30-G, 17.3.5.4, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"17.3.5.4 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions

[17.3.5.4.2 unchanged.]

"17.3.5.4.3 Additional Division II Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division II member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

"(a) Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico Contests. Not more

than one contest or tournament (not to exceed four contests) played in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, by a member institution located outside the area in question, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in the area in question;

"(b) ABAUSA Club. The one basketball game against a 'club' member of the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States of America;

"(c) Tip-Off Classic. The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game;

"(d) Foreign Team in Canada. The one basketball game against a foreign team in Canada, or

"(e) One contest against a foreign team in the United States.

"17.3.5.4.4 Conference Exception. The limitation in 17.3.5.4.3-(a) shall not apply to regular-season contests between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

C. Amend Proposal No. 30-G, 17.3.5, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.3.5.4 Once-in-Three-Years Exemptions

[17.3.5.5.1 unchanged.]

"17.3.5.5 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions—Division III. Not more than once every four years, a Division III member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

"(a) ABAUSA Club. The one basketball game against a 'club' member of the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States of America;

"(b) Tip-Off Classic. The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game;

"(c) Foreign Team in U.S. The one basketball game against a foreign team in the United States;

"(d) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico Contests. Not more than once every four years, a Division III member institution located outside of Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico may exempt from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests not more than four contests on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, or a tournament (not to exceed four contests) in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, or

"(e) Division III Scrimmages. For Division III only, the

two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition in basketball conducted between October 15 and the conclusion of the basketball season.

"17.3.5.5.1 Foreign-Tour Application. A member institution utilizing this exemption shall not participate in an institutionally certified foreign basketball tour in the same four-year period.

"17.3.5.6 Conference Exception. The limitations under 17.3.5.5-(d) shall not apply to regular-season contests between two members of the same NCAA conference."

Source: NCAA Council and St. John's University (New York).

Action: Approved by Division I (223-97, four abstentions) and Division II (149-30, two abstentions); defeated by Division III, 117-118, one abstention (and five defective ballots), roll-call votes

NO. 31 SPRING PRACTICE—DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 202, as follows:

[Division II football only, roll call]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice—Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II, 20 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 36 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 15 of the 20 sessions may involve contact;

"(b) Spring Practice—Division II. In Division II, 12 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 24 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar. Contact during such sessions is prohibited and practice sessions (including meetings) are limited to a maximum of two hours per day;"

[17.7.6-(b) through 17.7.6-(e), relettered as 17.7.6-(c) through 17.7.6-(f), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Steering Committee.

Intent: In Division II football, to reduce the permissible number of spring practice sessions from 20 to 12, to reduce the period during which the practice sessions may be conducted from 36 days to 24, to prohibit contact during spring football practice and to limit the length of each spring practice session to two hours per day.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II, 82-36, after being moved ahead of No. 30. Later motion to reconsider defeated, 41-75, one abstention, roll-call votes.

*** NO. 32 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL**

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7, pages 140-141, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"15.2.7 Summer Financial Aid. Summer financial aid may be awarded only to attend the awarding institution's summer term, or summer school or summer orientation program, provided the following conditions are met:

[15.2.7-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The student is attending a summer term, summer school or summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis to all participants in the program pursuant to 15.2.7.2

[15.2.7.1 unchanged.]

"15.2.7.2 Summer Orientation Financial Aid—Incoming Student-Athletes. The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution's in the summer orientation program prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

[15.2.7.2-(a) through 15.2.7.2-(d) deleted.]

"(a) The recipient shall be admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements;

"(b) The recipient is subject to NCAA transfer provisions pursuant to 14.6.2-(h);

"(c) During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any athletics practice activities (pursuant to 17.02.11), or use the institution's weight-training facilities, in any sport in which the recipient has been recruited (pursuant to 13.02.9) and subsequently participates on behalf of the awarding institution, and

"(d) The awarding institution certifies in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.6.2, page 120, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.6.2 Conditions Affecting Transfer Status. A transfer student

is a student who transfers from a collegiate institution after having met any one of the following conditions at that institution:

[14.6.2-(a) through 14.6.2-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) The student received institutional financial aid while attending a summer term, summer school or summer orientation program."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To permit summer financial aid to be awarded to a prospective student-athlete to attend an institution's summer term, summer school or summer orientation period, provided the recipient is admitted under published entrance requirements, is subject to the Association's transfer provisions, does not engage in any athletics practice (including use of the institution's weight-training facilities) during the summer term or orientation period in that sport, and receives only financial assistance granted without regard to athletics ability.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved. Part A approved as amended by No. 32—1, 464-220, nine abstentions, roll call. Part B approved by Division I (258-47, three abstentions) and Division II (147-17), roll-call votes.

NO. 32—1 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

Amend Proposal No. 32-A, 15.2.7.2-(c), as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"(c) During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any organized athletics practice activities (pursuant to 17.02.11) or use the institution's weight training facilities in any sport in which the recipient has been recruited (pursuant to 13.02.9) and subsequently participates on behalf of the awarding institution, and"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved, 501-165, 10 abstentions, roll-call vote.

NO. 33 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7, pages 140-141, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"15.2.7 Summer Financial Aid. Summer financial aid may be awarded only to attend the awarding institution's summer term, or summer school or summer orientation program, provided the following conditions are met:

[15.2.7-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The student is attending a summer term, summer school or summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis to all participants in the program pursuant to 15.2.7.2 [15.2.7.1 unchanged.]

"15.2.7.2 Summer Orientation Financial Aid—Incoming Student-Athletes. The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution's in the summer orientation program prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

[15.2.7.2-(a) through 15.2.7.2-(d) deleted.]

"(a) The recipient shall be admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements;

"(b) The recipient is subject to NCAA transfer provisions pursuant to 14.6.2-(h);

"(c) The recipient shall not engage in out-of-season practice activities pursuant to 17.02.11 and 17.02.12;

"(d) The recipient shall receive such aid only in proportion to the amount of financial aid that the recipient will receive during the succeeding academic year, and

"(e) The recipient shall become a countable student-athlete during the succeeding academic year pursuant to 15.5."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.6.2, page 120, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.6.2 Conditions Affecting Transfer Status. A transfer student is a student who transfers from a collegiate institution after having met any one of the following conditions at that institution:

[14.6.2-(a) through 14.6.2-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) The student received institutional financial aid while attending a summer term, summer school or summer orientation program."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Georgia; Louisiana State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Intent: To permit summer financial aid to be awarded to a prospective student-athlete to attend an institution's summer term, summer school or summer orientation period, provided the recipient is admitted under published entrance requirements, is subject to the Association's transfer provisions, does not engage in out-of-season practice activities, receives only financial assistance granted in proportion to the amount of financial aid that the student will receive during the succeeding academic year, and becomes a countable student-athlete during the succeeding academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated, 201-438, eight abstentions, roll-call vote, after being moved ahead of No. 32.

NO. 34 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.1, page 150, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"15.5.4.1 Division I-A Football. There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1) for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter, and an annual limit of 95 on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football at each Division I-A institution."

Source: Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma State University.

Intent: To increase from 25 to 30 the initial financial aid awards in Division I-A football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990; first effective for the 1990-91 academic year.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A, 26-80, three abstentions, roll call.

NO. 35 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.1, page 150, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"15.5.4.1 Division I-A Football—**Numerical Limitations.** There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1) for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter, and an annual limit of 95 on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football at each Division I-A institution as specified in this section.

"15.5.4.1.1 Initial Counters—**Standard Limitation—** 25. A member institution shall not award more than 25 countable initial grants.

"15.5.4.1.2 Initial Counters—**Alternate Limitation.** To determine the maximum number of initial counters during an academic year, a member institution first shall determine the total number of countable student-athletes to whom the institution awarded financial aid in football during the prior academic year; second, the institution shall subtract from the total the number of players included in that figure who have exhausted eligibility in the sport of football; third, the institution shall add 25 to the previous total; fourth, the institution shall subtract the resulting total from 95; fifth, the institution shall divide that total by two (2), and sixth, the institution shall add the resulting total to 25. The final total represents the institution's annual limitation on the number of initial counters during any consecutive two-year period.

"15.5.4.1.2.1 Additional Limitations. A member institution that utilizes this 'alternate' method to determine its numerical limitation for initial counters shall be subject to the following additional restrictions:

"(a) A member institution shall not exceed the annual limit on the total number of counters specified in 15.5.4.1.3, regardless of the available number of initial counters specified above;

"(b) A member institution shall not utilize the 'alternate' method during the time period in which the institution's football program is subject to sanctions imposed by the NCAA Committee on Infractions.

"(c) Beginning with the 1991-92 academic year, a member institution shall not utilize the 'alternate' method during an academic year unless that academic year is the first year in which the institution's head football coach serves in that capacity at that institution. Member institutions that qualify for and elect to utilize the 'alternate' method beginning with the 1990-91 academic year shall be exempt from this limitation;

"(d) A member institution shall not utilize the 'alternate' method if the Committee on Infractions determines (or has determined) that the institution's head football coach was involved personally in a 'major' violation (per 19.02.2.2) of NCAA recruiting legislation, and

"(e) A member institution shall not utilize the 'alternate' method if the institution employs, after August 1, 1990, a head football coach who has been involved personally in a 'major' violation (per 19.02.2.2) of NCAA recruiting legislation at any member institution.

"15.5.4.1.3 Annual Limitation. There shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of counters (including initial counters)."

Source: Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; University of New Mexico, and Texas Christian University.

Intent: To establish an alternate limitation on the annual number of initial counters in Division I-A football, enabling a member institution to exceed the current limit of 25 initial counters under certain specified conditions, including the stipulation that the annual limitation on the overall number of counters (95) may not be exceeded.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990; first effective for the 1990-91 academic year.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 37 PELL GRANTS

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.4.1, page 139, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.2.4.1 Pell Grants. A student-athlete may receive a Pell Grant in combination with other institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the value of a full grant-in-aid plus ~~\$1,400~~ **\$1,700** in Division I institutions or \$900 in Division II or Division III institutions, or the student-athlete's cost of attendance per 15.01.7 (**as determined by the institution's regular financial aid authority**), whichever is less."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive Pell Grant assistance in combination with other institutional financial aid provided the overall grant total does not exceed the value of a full grant plus \$1,700 or the student-athlete's cost of attendance, whichever is less.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I, 243-73. three abstentions, roll-call vote.

Academics

NO. 38 PARTIAL QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER—ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.3 by adding new 14 3.3.1, page 113, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.3.1 A fourth season of eligibility shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution. This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: All 12 members of the Big West Conference.

Intent: To permit nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers in Division I to earn a fourth season of athletics eligibility, provided they have completed 96 semester or 144 quarter units toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution by

the beginning of the fifth academic year following their initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I as amended by No. 38—1, 125-199, three abstentions, roll call. Division I first approved the proposal. A motion to reconsider was approved, as well as a motion for a roll-call vote.

NO. 38—1 PARTIAL QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER—ELIGIBILITY

Amend Proposal No. 38, 14.3.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.3.1 A fourth season of eligibility shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of ~~96~~ **105** semester or ~~144~~ **158** quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution. This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 39 SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS EXCEPTIONS

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4, pages 118-119, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.5.4 Exceptions to Satisfactory-Progress Rule.

"(a) Missed Term. One time during a student-athlete's entire period of intercollegiate enrollment, the provisions of 14.5.2-(a) may be prorated at 12 hours per term of actual attendance if the student-athlete misses a complete term or consecutive terms during an academic year, subject to the following conditions: (1) The student-athlete engaged in no outside competition in the sport during the academic term or terms in which the student was not in attendance; (2) the student was eligible for enrollment during the student's absence, and (3) the student has fulfilled the satisfactory-progress requirements (per 14.5.2) for the terms in which the student was in attendance. A transfer student from a two-year college is not eligible to utilize this one-time exception during the first academic year of residence at the certifying institution in order to maintain eligibility during the second year in residence. Hours earned while enrolled as a part-time student during the 'missed term' may not be

counted in meeting the satisfactory-progress requirement.

"(b) Midyear Enrollment. For students entering the institution at the beginning of the second semester or the second or third quarter of an academic year, the credit hours required under the satisfactory-progress regulation of 14.5.2-(a) may be prorated at 12 units per term of actual attendance during the initial regular academic year of attendance.

"(c) Nonrecruited, Nonparticipant. A student-athlete may qualify for a waiver of the application of the satisfactory-progress regulation for the initial season of eligibility if the student has been in residence at the certifying institution for more than one academic year; was not recruited; has not received athletically related financial assistance; has never practiced or participated in intercollegiate athletics, and is otherwise eligible under all institutional, conference and NCAA rules. The student-athlete's eligibility in subsequent seasons would be governed by the provisions of the satisfactory-progress rule (see 14.5.2), which would be applied from the beginning of the first term the student began participation.

"14.5.4 14.5.5 Waivers of Satisfactory-Progress Rule. The Academic Requirements Committee shall establish appropriate criteria for waivers of this legislation. Such waivers shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the Eligibility Committee. Waivers of the satisfactory-progress rule may be granted under any of the following conditions:"

[14.5.4-(a) and 14.5.4-(b) deleted; 14.5.4-(c) and 14.5.4-(d), renumbered and relettered as 14.5.5-(a) and 14.5.5-(b), unchanged; 14.5.4-(e) deleted.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To clarify that the missed term; midyear enrollment, and nonrecruited, nonparticipant legislation related to the Association's satisfactory-progress rule are exceptions (to be administered by member institutions) rather than waivers (to be administered by the conference members of the Association or by the Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 40 TEST-SCORE REPORT—DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1 by adding new 14.3.1.1.3, page 111, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.3.1.1.3 Test-Score Report. Division II member institu-

tions may utilize a prospect's SAT or ACT score obtained either from the appropriate testing agency or from an official copy of the individual's high-school transcript to determine the prospect's initial eligibility."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit a Division II member institution to obtain a prospect's ACT or SAT score from either the appropriate testing agency or an official copy of the individual's high-school transcript to determine the prospect's initial eligibility.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II

Financial Aid

NO. 41 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.01.7, page 134, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.01.7 Maximum Institutional Financial Aid to Individual. An institution shall not award financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations established by the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. Any financial aid permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the student-athlete."

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.4.1, page 136, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.02.4.1 Divisions I and II. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled."

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.3, page 139, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"15.2.3 Books and Supplies. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that covers the actual cost of required course-related books and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled."

[Remainder of 15.2.3 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Legislative Proposals

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete's institutional financial assistance may include the cost of supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Defeated as amended by No. 41—2, 399-235, two-thirds majority required.

NO. 41—1 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

A Amend Proposal No. 41-A, 15.01.7, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.01.7 Maximum Institutional Financial Aid to Individual. An institution shall not award financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations established by the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. Any financial aid permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the student-athlete. **Supplies of a consumable nature (e.g., paper, posters, photographic film) may be provided to a student-athlete, but supplies of a nonconsumable nature (e.g., computers, cameras) may be provided only on an issuance-and-retrieval basis.**"

B. Amend Proposal No. 41-B, 15.02.4.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.02.4.1 Divisions I and II. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled. **Supplies of a consumable nature (e.g., paper, posters, photographic film) may be provided to a student-athlete, but supplies of a nonconsumable nature (e.g., computers, cameras) may be provided only on an issuance-and-retrieval basis.**"

C. Amend Proposal No. 41-C, 15.2.3, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"15.2.3 Books and Supplies. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that covers the actual cost of required course-related books and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled. **Supplies of a consumable nature (e.g., paper, posters, photographic film) may be provided to a student-athlete, but supplies of a nonconsumable nature (e.g., computers, cameras) may be provided only on an issuance-and-retrieval basis.**"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Defeated, 181-431.

NO. 41—2 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

A Amend Proposal No. 41-A, 15.01.7, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.01.7 Maximum Institutional Financial Aid to Individual. An institution shall not award financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations established by the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. Any financial aid permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the student-athlete. **The total retail value of all supplies provided shall not exceed \$150 per academic year.**"

B. Amend Proposal No. 41-B, 15.02.4.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.02.4.1 Divisions I and II. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled. **The total retail value of all supplies provided shall not exceed \$150 per academic year.**"

C. Amend Proposal No. 41-C, 15.2.3, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"15.2.3 Books and Supplies. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that covers the actual cost of required course-related books and those supplies required of all students in each course in which the student-athlete is enrolled. **The total retail value of all supplies provided shall not exceed \$150 per academic year.**"

Source: All eight members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 42 SUMMER SCHOOL FINANCIAL AID

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7, pages 140-141, by deleting the current dominant voting requirement (*) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/I/III)

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit the application of the Association's summer financial aid legislation on a division-by-division basis by changing the applicable regulation from a dominant to a federated provision.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 43 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7.1 by adding new 15.2.7.1.1, page 141, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.2.7.1.1 Enrolled Student-Athletes. Except for students attending a summer orientation program per 15.2.7.(b), a student-athlete shall not receive athletically related financial aid to attend the institution's summer term or summer school unless the student-athlete received such athletically related aid during the previous academic year. Further, such aid may be awarded only in proportion to the amount of athletically related financial aid received by the student-athlete during the previous academic year."

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.1.8, page 148, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.5.1.8 Summer-Term Aid. Institutional financial aid received during a summer term is not countable in these limitations and does not make a student-athlete a counter. The athletically related financial aid received by a student-athlete during a summer term shall count toward the institution's maximum grant-in-aid limitations by sport during the ensuing academic year."

Source: University of Alabama; Tuscaloosa; University of Hawaii; Louisiana State University; University of Miami (Florida); University of Mississippi; University of Notre Dame, and one other member institution.

Intent: To specify that an enrolled student-athlete shall not receive athletically related financial assistance to attend an institution's summer school or summer term unless the student received athletically related aid during the prior academic year and the summer aid is in proportion to the amount of athletically related aid the student received during the prior academic year, and to specify that the athletically related financial aid received by a student-athlete during the summer shall count toward the institution's maximum grant-in-aid limitations during the ensuing academic year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990

Action: Part A approved by Divisions I and II; Part B withdrawn.

NO. 44 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.2, page 150, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.4.2 Division I-AA Football. There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1), an annual limit of 70 60 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 95 on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football at each Division I-AA institution."

Source: All seven members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Intent: To reduce from 70 to 60 the financial aid equivalency limitation in Division I-AA football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1991; first effective for the 1991-92 academic year.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA.

NO. 45 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.2, page 150, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.4.2 Division I-AA Football. There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1), an annual limit of 70 65 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 95 on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football at each Division I-AA institution."

Source: Colgate University; University of Connecticut; University of Delaware; University of Maine; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of New Hampshire, and three other member institutions.

Intent: To reduce from 70 to 65 the financial aid equivalency limitation in Division I-AA football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990; first effective for the 1990-91 academic year.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA. First approved, 47-41; then defeated after successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 46 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.3 5, page 150, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"15.5.4.3.5 Divisions I-A and I-AA—Aid First Awarded Subsequent to Second Year. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, a student-athlete who has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years may receive athletically related financial aid for the first time without such aid counting

as an initial award, provided the aid falls within the overall grant limitation."

Source: All nine members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit members of Division I-A to award athletically related financial aid to a football student-athlete for the first time and exempt such aid from the initial grant limitation if the student-athlete has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I-A.

NO. 47 EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS—EXHAUSTED ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3 by adding new 15.02 3.5, page 136, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.02.3.5 Exempted Employment Earnings. Employment earnings of a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport during the prior academic year shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or the cost of attendance for a student-athlete, provided the student-athlete subsequently does not practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: All eight members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that the term-time earnings of an undergraduate student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport during the preceding academic year are exempt from the grant-in-aid or cost-of-attendance limitation, provided the student does not subsequently practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 48 FINANCIAL AID—EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATION

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.3, page 149, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.3.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

[15.5.3.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) A fraction shall be created, with the amount actually received by the student-athlete as the numerator and the full grant-in-aid value for that student-athlete as the denominator,

based upon the actual cost or average cost of a full grant for all students at that institution."

[15.5.3.3-(c) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that member institutions may utilize either the actual-cost or averaging method in determining a student-athlete's equivalency value.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 48—1 FINANCIAL AID—EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATION

Amend Proposal No. 48, 15.5.3.3-(b), as follows.

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) A fraction shall be created, with the amount received by the student-athlete as the numerator and the full grant-in-aid value for that student-athlete as the denominator, based upon the actual cost of tuition and fees (per 15.2.1) and the actual or average room and board cost of a full grant for all students at that institution."

Source: Central Connecticut State University

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 49 MULTIPLE-SPORT PARTICIPANTS—MEN'S ICE HOCKEY

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.5 by adding new 15.5.5.3, page 151, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.5.3 Ice Hockey, Men's. A counter who practices or competes in men's ice hockey and one or more other sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in men's ice hockey."

Source: University of Connecticut, University of Lowell, University of Maine, Merrimack College, Providence College and Seton Hall University.

Intent: To specify that a multiple-sport participant who practices or competes in men's ice hockey and one or more other sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in men's ice hockey.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 50 EQUIVALENCY EXEMPTION—ACADEMIC HONOR AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.3 by adding new paragraph 15.5.3.3.1, page 149, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.5.3.3.1 Exception. Academic honor awards that meet the following criteria are exempt from the institution's equivalency computation:

"(a) The award is part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletics interests and in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution;

"(b) The recipient was ranked in the upper 20 percent of the high-school graduating class or achieved a cumulative grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or a minimum ACT score of 24 or a minimum SAT score of 1,050, or

"(c) The recipient does not qualify under (b) and has completed at least one academic year in college and achieved a cumulative grade-point average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to exempt from the institution's equivalency computations academic honor awards that meet specified criteria.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division II

NO. 51 NONATHLETICS ACHIEVEMENT AWARD— DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend 15.4 by adding new 15.4.6.4 and deleting 15.4.7, page 145, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only]

"15.4.6.4 Nonathletics Achievement Awards. The Council shall have the authority to approve requests from Division III institutions to grant a nonathletics achievement award to a student-athlete. Competition for such an award must be among all members of the student body in general who meet certain publicized qualifications, the award must have no relationship to athletics ability or participation, the institution may establish no quota for such awards for student-athletes, the form utilized by the student-athlete to apply for the award must have no reference to athletics ability or participation, the award must be identified in the appropriate institutional publication listing financial aid awards available to all students, and the award must be consistent with Bylaw 15.4.9. The Council shall establish a process for granting requests for approval of nonathletics achievement awards; shall monitor the actions taken under this autho-

rization, and shall report annually to the membership the actions taken in summary, aggregate form."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit the Council to approve requests from Division III member institutions to provide student-athletes nonathletics achievement awards that meet specified criteria but are not based on the consideration of financial need, and to delete the current legislative provision governing leadership and merit awards in Division III.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division III as amended by No. 51—1.

NO. 51—1 NONATHLETICS ACHIEVEMENT AWARD— DIVISION III

Amend Proposal No. 51, 15.4, as follows:

[Division III only]

"Bylaws: Amend 15.4 by adding new 15.4.6.4 and deleting 15.4.7, page 145, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:"
[15.4.6.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Steering Committee.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Eligibility

[Note: The NCAA Executive Committee has submitted the following three proposals, Nos. 52 through 54, for decision by the membership regarding the related issues of individual ineligibility for the use of banned drugs, year-round drug testing and team-ineligibility sanctions for positive drug tests. The Council endorses each of these proposals. The Presidents Commission, at the request of the Executive Committee, has designated all three for roll-call votes.]

NO. 52 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY—USE OF BANNED DRUGS

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.1.2 by adding new 14.1.1.2.1, page 104, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"14.1.1.2.1 Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs. A student-athlete who is found to have utilized a substance on the list of banned drugs, as set forth in 31.2.3.1, shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason and regular-season competition in accordance with the ineligibility provisions in 18.4.1.5.1."

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.1.5, page 261, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"18.4.1.5 Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs. A student-athlete who is found to have utilized (in preparation for or participation in an

NCAA championship or certified postseason football game) a substance on the list of banned drugs, as set forth in 31.2.3.1, shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason **and regular-season** competition in accordance with the ineligibility provisions in 18.4.1.5.1 The certifying institution may appeal to the Eligibility Committee for restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility if the institution concludes that circumstances warrant restoration.

"18.4.1.5.1 Duration of Ineligibility. A student-athlete who tests positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall remain ineligible for *postseason competition for a minimum of 90 days after the test date* **all regular-season and postseason competition during the time period ending one calendar year after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined in 31.2.3.1, after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of one season of *postseason eligibility competition* in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for **regular-season and** postseason competition at least through the next *academic* calendar year."**

[18.4.1.5.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Subcommittee to Review Drug-Testing Ineligibility Sanctions).

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who is found to have utilized a banned drug shall be declared ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition through the time period ending one calendar year after the student-athlete's positive drug test and until the student-athlete retests negative and has eligibility restored by the Eligibility Committee; to specify that a student-athlete who tests positive for the use of any drug, other than a "street drug," after being restored to eligibility pursuant to a prior positive drug test, shall suffer a lifetime ban from regular-season and postseason eligibility, and to specify that a student-athlete who tests positive for the use of a "street drug" after being restored to eligibility shall suffer the loss of one season of competition in all sports and shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by all divisions, 292-19, seven abstentions, in

Division I; 164-2 in Division II; 203-4 in Division III. All roll-call votes.

NO. 53 YEAR-ROUND DRUG TESTING

Bylaws: Amend 18.4.1.5, page 261, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"18.4.1.5 Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs. A student-athlete who is found to have utilized (*in preparation for or participation in an NCAA championship or certified postseason football game*) a substance on the list of banned drugs, as set forth in 31.2.3.1, shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason competition in accordance with the ineligibility provisions in 18.4.1.5.1. The certifying institution may appeal to the Eligibility Committee for restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility if the institution concludes that circumstances warrant restoration.

[18.4.1.5.1 unchanged.]

"18.4.1.5.2 Banned Drugs and Drug-Testing Methods. The Executive Committee shall adopt a list of banned drugs, **and** shall authorize methods for drug testing of student-athletes who compete in NCAA championships and certified postseason football games, and, in conjunction with the Council, may provide guidelines for drug testing of student-athletes by member institutions during the regular season **on a year-round basis**. The list of banned drugs and the procedure for informing member institutions about authorized methods for drug testing at NCAA championships are set forth in 31.2.3.1 and 31.2.3.4, respectively."

[18.4.1.5.2.1 deleted.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Intent: To establish a year-round drug-testing program and to abolish the Association's voluntary off-season drug-testing program. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$1.6 million.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by all divisions, 272-39, seven abstentions, in Division I; 138-23 in Division II; 159-49, three abstentions, in Division III. All roll-call votes.

NO. 54 POSTSEASON ELIGIBILITY—USE OF BANNED DRUGS

Bylaws: Amend 31.2.3.6, page 335, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"31.2.3.6 Individual Eligibility—Team Sanctions. *The application of all* Executive regulations pertaining to team-eligibility sanctions for positive tests resulting from the NCAA drug-testing program *is suspended from September 1, 1987, until the end of the 1989-90 academic year, except* **shall apply only** in the following situation: If a student-athlete is declared ineligible prior to an NCAA team championship or a certified postseason football game and the insti-

tution knowingly allows him or her to participate, all team-ineligibility sanctions shall apply (i.e., the team shall be required to forfeit its awards and any net receipts it may have earned and the team's and student-athlete's performances shall be deleted from NCAA records). In the case of certified postseason football contests, the team's and student-athlete's performances shall be deleted from NCAA records."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Executive Committee (Subcommittee to Review Drug-Testing Ineligibility Sanctions).

Intent: To specify that team-eligibility sanctions related to the use of banned drugs in NCAA championships and certified postseason football games shall not apply except as noted and applied currently.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved, 658-20, three abstentions, roll call.

NO. 55 DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.01.3, page 101, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.01.3 Student-Athlete Responsibility—Information Related to Eligibility. Prior to competing in intercollegiate athletics each academic year, the student-athlete shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the Council (see 30.9) in which the student provides information on various aspects of eligibility, including those regulations identified in 14.01.4, as well as information about involvement in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition under governing legislation of the Association, and in which the student **reviews general information concerning postseason drug-testing awareness. The student-athlete also shall consent in writing in a separate form prescribed by the NCAA Council to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually attesting to eligibility under NCAA legislation and affirming awareness of the postseason drug-testing program shall result in the student-athlete's being ineligible for all intercollegiate athletics competition for that year. Failure to sign the drug-testing consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for postseason competition for that year.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.3.1, page 104, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.3.1 Content and Purpose. Prior to participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year, the student-athlete shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities related to intercollegiate athletics competition under the Association's governing legislation, and in

which the individual **reviews general information concerning postseason drug-testing awareness. The student-athlete also shall consent in writing in a separate form prescribed by the NCAA Council to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement attesting to eligibility under NCAA legislation and affirming awareness of the postseason drug-testing program shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition for that year. Failure to sign the drug-testing consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for postseason competition for that year.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To administer the student-athlete drug-testing consent form separately from the student-athlete statement, to include general information regarding postseason drug-testing awareness in the latter document, to specify that failure to sign the statement attesting to eligibility under NCAA legislation and affirming awareness of the postseason drug-testing program shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition for that year, and to specify that failure to sign the drug-testing consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in postseason competition for that year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 56 RESOLUTION: FRESHMAN INELIGIBILITY— DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

[Division I only]

"Whereas, based on results from the American Institutes for Research Study of Intercollegiate Athletics, student-athletes in the sport of men's basketball spend more time on athletically related activities than academically related activities; and

"Whereas, the time and travel demands, exposure, and pressures associated with Division I men's basketball are significant and, thus, the basketball community in general and the Committee on Basketball Issues in particular believe that student-athletes need more opportunity to adjust socially, athletically and culturally to the college atmosphere prior to competing in intercollegiate athletics; and

"Whereas, studies have shown that very few student-athletes graduate in four years; and

"Whereas, many student-athletes exhaust their athletics eligibility in four years, even though they are (based upon current NCAA satisfactory-progress requirements) on a five-year academic plan, and leave school after their eligibility expires because they often cannot afford to pay for the fifth year of school when they no longer are receiving athletics grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas, providing student-athletes with three seasons of eligibility and offering an opportunity to earn a fourth season of eligibility if they are within one year of graduation will encourage student-athletes to remain enrolled as full-time student-athletes for a fifth year academically and will increase graduation rates; and

"Whereas, the Committee on Basketball Issues recognizes the positive effect that NCAA Bylaw 14.3 has had on the high-school academic performance of prospective student-athletes and does not wish to diminish significantly the bylaw's academically motivating effect;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Presidents Commission and Council be directed to review and consider as legislative amendments at the 1991 NCAA Convention proposals that would eliminate freshman eligibility for competition in the sport of Division I men's basketball, but would continue to utilize Bylaw 14.3 to determine eligibility for practice and institutional financial aid; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Commission and Council consider companion legislation specifying that student-athletes in Division I men's basketball be eligible initially for three seasons of competition in that sport, and that at the beginning of the student-athlete's fifth academic year of collegiate enrollment, the individual be given the opportunity to earn a fourth season of eligibility conditioned upon the student-athlete being within 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of graduation, or being enrolled in a second baccalaureate degree program or a graduate degree program."

Source: University of Kansas; University of Kentucky; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Temple University; Utah State University, and Virginia Commonwealth University.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 162-165. Later motion to reconsider defeated.

NO. 57 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER—NONQUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.1.2, pages 121-122, as follows:
{Division I only}

"14.6.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. The student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, and has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution **and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms).** Further, such a student who first enrolled as a regular student in a two-year institution after August 1, 1988, must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 for the 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree program at

the certifying institution."

[14.6.4.1.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi, and three other member institutions.

Intent: To require a two-year college transfer student who was a nonqualifier to attend a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters to be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence at a Division I member institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990; for those student-athletes first entering two-year colleges after August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 58 SEASONS OF COMPETITION—20-YEAR AGE RULE

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.5, pages 108-109, as follows:
[Division I only]

"14.2.4.5 Participation After 20th Birthday. Any participation as an individual or a team representative in organized sports competition by a student during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to initial full-time enrollment in a member **collegiate** institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport. *However,* The student shall not be charged with more than one season of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. **In addition, if in any 12-month period following the student's 20th birthday the student participates in organized sports competition, matriculates at a collegiate institution and begins a collegiate season in that sport, the student may complete that collegiate season without being charged an additional season of competition in that sport.** Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted."

[Remainder of 14.2.4.5 unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To specify that a student who enrolls at any (rather than only an NCAA member) collegiate institution prior to the student's 20th birthday is exempt from the 20-year age rule, and to permit a student-athlete who competes in organized competition during any 12-month period following the student's 20th birthday and begins collegiate competition during the same year to complete that collegiate season without being charged an additional season of competition in that sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

**NO. 59 SEASONS OF COMPETITION—DIVISION II
TRACK AND CROSS COUNTRY**

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.2, page 108, as follows:
[Division II only]

"14.2.4.2 Track and Cross Country

"14.2.4.2.1 In Divisions I, II and Division III, cross country, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field shall be considered separate sports."

[14.2.4.2.2 deleted.]

Source: Central Missouri State University, Lincoln University (Missouri), Northeast Missouri State University, Northwest Missouri State University, Pittsburg State University, Southwest Baptist University and two other member institutions.

Intent: To specify that indoor track and field and outdoor track and field shall be considered separate sports in the determination of seasons of competition in Division II, consistent with the current rule in Divisions I and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 60 GRADUATE-STUDENT ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.7.2, page 106, by deleting the current dominant voting requirement (*) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the application of the Association's legislation governing graduate-student eligibility on a division-by-division basis by changing the applicable regulation from a dominant to a federated provision.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 61 TRANSFER RULE—WAIVER PROVISION

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.2 by adding new 14.6.2.1, page 120, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.2.1 Council-Authorized Waiver. The Council shall have the authority to authorize waivers of the definition of a transfer student based upon objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances that warrant the waiver of the application of this section. The Council shall establish a process for granting such a waiver; shall monitor the actions taken under this authorization, and shall report

annually to the membership the actions taken in summary, aggregate form."

Source: All nine members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To authorize the Council to grant waivers of the legislative definition of a transfer student in cases in which objective evidence warrants such a waiver.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn.

**NO. 62 JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY—
DISCONTINUED/NONSPONSORED SPORT
EXCEPTION**

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.5.1, page 124, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.4.5.1 Discontinued/Non-sponsored Sport Exception. The student changed institutions in order to continue participation in a sport because the student's original two-year college dropped the sport from its intercollegiate program (even though it may subsequently establish that sport on a club basis) or never sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at that institution, provided the student never attended any other collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that sport and the student earned at least a minimum 2.000 grade-point average at the two-year college. **An individual who is a partial qualifier or nonqualifier shall not be permitted to utilize this exception.**"

[14.6.4.5.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee)

Intent: To confirm that a partial qualifier or nonqualifier transferring to a Division I or Division II institution from a two-year college or a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program shall not be permitted to utilize the discontinued/non-sponsored sport exception to the transfer residence requirement.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 63 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3, pages 125-127, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.5.3 Exceptions or Waivers for Transfers From Four-Year Colleges. A transfer student from a four-year collegiate institution is not subject to the residence requirement for intercollegiate competition if any one of the following conditions is met.

During the student-athlete's first academic year of full-time enrollment, such conditions may serve as a basis for a waiver of or an exception to the residence requirement only for transfer students who are qualifiers per 14.02.9.1."

[Remainder of 14.6.5.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that waivers of the transfer residence requirement are available in the first academic year of residence only for transfer student-athletes from four-year colleges who are qualifiers per 14.02.9.1.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 64 ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION— FINANCIAL AID

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, pages 126-127, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

[14.6.5.3.10-(a) and 14.6.5.3.10-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance at the previous institution, or the previous institution verifies in writing that the student's athletically related financial assistance either (1) was not renewed for the ensuing academic year for reasons that were unrelated to the student's transfer or that were beyond the control of the student, or (2) was renewed for the ensuing year but the institution has dropped the student from the team for which the student had been awarded that aid initially. The student would not meet this condition if the nonrenewal occurred after it was learned that the student was planning to transfer, and the student may not have rejected or failed to accept an official offer of financial aid (initial or renewal) from the previous institution. (Note: In the application of this regulation, 'athletically related financial assistance' is only that aid specifically administered as an athletics grant through the institution's athletics scholarship fund, and not other institutional financial aid.)"

[14.6.5.3.10-(d) through 14.6.5.3.10-(f), relettered as 14.6.5.3.10-(c) through 14.6.5.3.10-(e), unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To delete the consideration of a student-athlete's financial aid or team membership status at the original institution from the one-time exception to the transfer residence requirement.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I (175-125) and by Division II.

NO. 65 ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION— DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, pages 126-127, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

"(a) The student is a participant in a sport other than **Division I** basketball, **Division I-A** or **I-AA** football, or **Division I** men's ice hockey;"

[Remainder of 14.6.5.3.10 unchanged.]

Source: All 14 members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete participating in Division II basketball, football or men's ice hockey to qualify for the one-time exception to the transfer residence requirement.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II. First was defeated; then approved after successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 66 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY—'4-2-4' COLLEGE TRANSFERS

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.6, page 127, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.6 '4-2-4' College Transfers. A student who transfers from a four-year college to a two-year college and then to the certifying institution shall complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless the student:

"(a) Has completed a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of **transferable degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000** at the two-year college following transfer from the four-year college most recently attended, one calendar year has elapsed since the transfer from that four-year college and the student has graduated from the two-year college;"

[Remainder of 14.6.6 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To specify that the minimum 24 semester or 36 quarter hours presented by a student-athlete who transfers from a four-year college to a two-year college and then to the certifying institution shall be transferable degree credit hours and shall include a minimum grade-point average of 2.000.

Effective Date: Immediately; for those student-athletes first entering two-year colleges after adjournment of this Convention.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 67 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY—DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3 by adding new 14.6.5.3.11, page 127, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.6.5.3.11 Division II Student-Athlete Transferring From Division I. The student transfers to the certifying Division II institution from a Division I institution, provided the student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student's being granted an exception to the transfer residence requirement."

Source: All 14 members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a transfer student from a Division I to a Division II institution to be eligible for intercollegiate competition immediately, provided the student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the exception to the transfer residence requirement.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division II. First was approved; then defeated after successful motion to reconsider.

General

NO. 68 LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Constitution: Amend 5.3, pages 32-36, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3 AMENDMENT PROCESS

"5.3.1 Authorizing Legislation

[5.3.1.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.1.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. A proposed amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting, provided. From July 1 through September 1, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal, including revisions that are more or less restrictive than the original proposal. After September 1, proposed amendments may be amended only if the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the provision to be amended.

"5.3.2 Sponsorship

"5.3.2.1 Amendment. An amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be sponsored by:

[5.3.2.1-(a) through 5.3.2.1-(f) and 5.3.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.2.1.2 Primary Contact Person. All amendments to the constitution and bylaws proposed by member institutions shall designate a primary contact person from among the proposal's sponsors.

[Remainder of 5.3.2 unchanged.]

"5.3.3 Submission Deadline

[5.3.3.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.3.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. Sponsors of proposed amendments must submit amendments to their original proposals in writing no later than September 1, unless the amendment-to-amendment does not increase the modification specified in the original proposal per 5.3.12. Any amendment to a proposed amendment submitted after September 1 shall not increase the modification of the original proposal and must be submitted in writing to the Association's national office not later than October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention.

[Remainder of 5.3.3.2 and 5.3.4 unchanged.]

"5.3.5 Notification to Membership

"5.3.5.1 Initial Publication. Proposed amendments shall be published in *The NCAA News* for the information of the membership as follows:

"(a) Not later than August 1—Those proposed by the membership, including the primary contact person's name, title and member institution or member conference, as well as the sponsors' statements of intent and rationale; and

[Remainder of 5.3.5.1, 5.3.5.2 and 5.3.5.3 unchanged.]

"5.3.5.4 Amendment-to-Amendment Copies of all amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the proposal's original sponsors pursuant to the September 1 deadline shall be published by September 15. Copies of all other amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the October 15 deadline shall be published in the Official Notice of the Convention.

[5.3.6 and 5.3.7 unchanged.]

"5.3.8 Intent and Rationale. All amendments to provisions of the constitution and bylaws shall include a statement of intent and a separate statement of rationale. The statement of rationale shall not exceed 200 words in length."

[5.3.8, 5.3.9 and 5.3.10, renumbered as 5.3.9, 5.3.10 and 5.3.11, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Intent: To revise the Association's amendment process to establish

new deadlines for amendments-to-amendments, to require the identification of a primary contact person for the submission of legislative proposals, to redefine permissible amendments-to-amendments, to establish a new publication date for certain amendments-to-amendments, and to require the submission and publication of statements of intent and rationale for all legislative proposals.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 69 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 69 AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION FOR 1991 AND 1992 DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

A. Resolution:

[Division I only, roll call]

"Whereas, the Executive Committee's report to the 1990 Convention includes its approval of the recommendation of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee to specify criteria for determining automatic qualification for the Division I Men's Basketball Championship limited to 30 conferences as selected by the basketball committee; and

"Whereas, the number of conferences eligible for automatic qualification thus will exceed the number of automatic bids, commencing with the 1991 Division I Men's Basketball Championship; and

"Whereas, as a matter of fairness, a conference's automatic qualification into the championship should be determined on the basketball court; and

"Whereas, although no criteria can provide a clear basis for completely excluding any conference, the Executive Committee's recommendation will deny some conferences any opportunity to compete in the championship; and

"Whereas, the criteria recommended by the basketball committee include new competitive criteria that are not clear in their application and have not been discussed with the Division I membership; and

"Whereas, the unfairness of excluding a conference and its membership from the championship will be aggravated by these uncertainties in the selection process; and

"Whereas, the membership is in the process of considering fundamental changes in the structure of Division I membership, particularly in regard to men's basketball (e.g., through the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Membership Structure and through review of season limitations and of freshman ineligibility), and no eligible conference should be put at risk of exclusion from the championship during this transitional period;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that because the Executive Committee's report to this Convention does not provide an 'on-the-court' opportunity for automatic qualification into the Division I Men's Basketball Championship for every eligible conference in 1991 or 1992, this Convention does not accept that report to the extent that it is inconsistent with this resolution; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that an appropriate number of the automatic bids approved by the Executive Committee should be awarded to the winner(s) of 'play-in' game(s) as described herein; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that 'play-in' games each year should be contested between the champions of the lowest-ranked conferences, as determined by the Division I Men's Basketball Committee based on that year's records, and that the number of such conferences involved in the 'play-in' games each year should equal twice the difference between the number of eligible conferences that year and the total number of automatic bids to be awarded that year; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that any 'play-in' game(s) should be conducted by the participating conferences, incurring and sharing equally all costs and deriving and sharing equally all financial benefits; should match the highest- and lowest-seeded conference champions involved, and should be completed before the selection date for the championship."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, page 184, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) and 17.3.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) **Automatic-Qualification Contests. Contests between conference champions that are provided by Convention, Council or Executive Committee action in order to determine selection for automatic qualification into the championship.**"

[17.3.5.2-(c) through 17.3.5.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(d) through 17.3.5.2-(g), unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group and all 12 members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Intent: To resolve that every conference eligible to receive automatic qualification to the 1991 and 1992 Division I Men's Basketball Championships shall have the opportunity to compete directly for such qualification, and to exempt from the limitation on countable contests in Division I men's basketball any "play-in" games conducted for the purpose of determining selection for automatic qualification into the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part B approved by Division I, 302-20, roll call. Part A withdrawn.

**NO. 70 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE MEN'S AND
WOMEN'S FENCING CHAMPIONSHIPS**

Bylaws: Amend 18.3.1, page 259, as follows.

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.3.1 National Collegiate Championships

Men	Men and Women	Women
Fencing	Fencing	Fencing"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To establish a combined-scoring National Collegiate Men's and Women's Fencing Championships event.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 71 BOWL-GAME NEGOTIATIONS

Bylaws: Amend 18.7.4, page 264, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"18.7.4 Restrictions on Game Negotiations

"18.7.4.1 Bowl Representatives. An official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game shall not extend formally an invitation to participate in its game to a representative of a member institution (including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes) from August 1 to:

[18.7.4.1-(a), 18.7.4.1-(b) and 18.7.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"18.7.4.1.2 **Penalty Penalties.** If the management of the certified game violates this provision, it shall return to the Association a percentage (not to exceed 50 percent) of its share of gross receipts from the contest (that were determined in accordance with 30.8.8 and 31.5.1), with the amount to be determined by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee and approved by the Council. **In addition, the subcommittee, with the Council's approval, may impose on the bowl game a one-year loss of certification.**

"18.7.4.2 Institution. A representative of a member institution (including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes) shall not accept formally any invitation from any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game from August 1 to:

[18.7.4.2-(a), 18.7.4.2-(b) and 18.7.4.2.1 unchanged.]

"18.7.4.2.2 **Penalty Penalties.** A member institution that violates 18.7.4.2 shall be prohibited from participating

in any postseason football game for a minimum of *two* one years or shall be required to return to the Association a percentage (not to exceed 50 percent) of its share of the gross receipts from the contest, with the actual amount returned to be determined by the subcommittee and approved by the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To specify that the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee, with the Council's approval, may impose a one-year loss of certification on bowl games that violate the Association's restrictions on game negotiations; and to specify that the subcommittee, with the Council's approval, may require a member institution that violates the restrictions on game negotiations to return to the Association a percentage (not to exceed 50 percent) of its share of gross receipts from the contest.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

**NO. 72 POSTSEASON BOWL-GAME
ELIGIBILITY—WRITTEN REPORT**

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.7.1 by adding new 18.7.1.1, page 263, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"18.7.1.1 **Institutional Eligibility—Written Report.** The director of athletics of a member institution that participates in a postseason bowl game shall submit by the subsequent February 1 a written report on the event as specified in 30.8.1 if the institution is to be eligible to participate in a postseason bowl game during the subsequent academic year. A member institution may appeal bowl-game ineligibility pursuant to this section to the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee at its annual spring meeting and, subsequently, to the Council during its annual August meeting."

B. Bylaws: Amend 30.8 by adding new 30.8.1, page 321, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"30.8.1 **Written Report.** The director of athletics of a member institution that participates in a postseason bowl game shall submit to the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee a written report on the conduct and administration of the event, with special emphasis on game management. The report shall be submitted by the subsequent February 1 on a form approved by the NCAA Council. An institution that fails to submit the report by the February 1 deadline shall be in-

eligible to participate in a postseason bowl game during the subsequent academic year."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To require institutions that participate in a postseason football game to submit a written report on the conduct and administration of the event as a prerequisite for future bowl-game eligibility, and to specify appeal procedures pursuant to this process.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I-A as amended by No. 72—1.

NO. 72—1 POSTSEASON BOWL-GAME ELIGIBILITY—WRITTEN REPORT

A. Amend Proposal No. 72-A, 18.7.1.1, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"18.7.1.1 Institutional Eligibility—Written Report. The director of athletics of a member institution that participates in a postseason bowl game shall submit by the subsequent February 1 a written report on the event as specified in 30.8.1 *if the institution is to be eligible to participate in a postseason bowl game during the subsequent academic year. A member institution may appeal bowl game ineligibility pursuant to this section to the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee at its annual spring meeting and, subsequently, to the Council during its annual August meeting.*"

B. Amend Proposal No. 72-B, 30.8, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"30.8.1 Written Report. The director of athletics of a member institution that participates in a postseason bowl game shall submit to the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee a written report on the conduct and administration of the event, with special emphasis on game management. The report shall be submitted by the subsequent February 1 on a form approved by the NCAA Council. *An institution that fails to submit the report by the February 1 deadline shall be ineligible to participate in a postseason bowl game during the subsequent academic year.*"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I-A.

NO. 73 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.3.3, page 284, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.3.3.3 Counting Multiteam Events in Individual Sports. In the individual sports, *each not more than two* institution-vs.-institution meetings shall be counted **as contests** in any multiteam competition (e.g., quadrangular track meet). If the institution achieves a single score in competition with the other com-

peting institutions (e.g., a conference championship), it shall be counted as one contest."

[20.9.3.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that for purposes of meeting the Division I sports sponsorship criteria in individual sports, not more than two institution-vs.-institution meetings in a multiteam competition shall be counted as contests.

Effective Date: September 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 74 MEMBERSHIP—EFFECTIVE DATES AND DIVISION III FINANCIAL AID REQUIREMENTS

A. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.2.1.1, page 275, as follows.

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.2.1.1 Determination of Division/Submission for Election. At the time of application, a prospective member shall designate the membership division it desires and any desired multidivision classification per 20.4. The membership application shall be reviewed with regard to the prospective member's conformance with applicable division criteria. The application then shall be submitted for possible election to membership (effective the following September 1, *the beginning of practice in any sport or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first*), in accordance with the provisions of Constitution 3."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.3.5.2.4, pages 277-278, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.3.5.2.4 Effective Date of Waiver. If the division votes to admit the institution as a member of that division, such classification shall become effective:

[20.3.5.2.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) September 1 following the Convention *(or the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first)* if an active member institution is seeking multidivision classification or change of division membership, or

[Remainder of 20.3.5.2.4 unchanged.]

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.4.2.2, page 279, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.4.2.2 Compliance With Criteria. If the member has met all applicable division membership criteria of this article and has complied for the two years preceding June 1 with all other bylaw requirements as they pertain to the sport in question (**other than the Division III financial aid requirements set forth in 15.4, except that athletically related financial aid may not be awarded to incoming freshmen or transfer students**), the *applicant member* shall be eligible for participation in

the division in that sport effective the September 1 that the institution selects as its effective date, *the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first.*"

D. Bylaws: Amend 20.5.2.2, page 279, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.5.2.2 Compliance With Criteria. If the member has met all applicable membership criteria of this article for the division to which it intends to transfer and has complied for the two years preceding June 1 with all other division bylaw requirements (*except other than the Division III financial aid requirements set forth in 15.4, except that athletically related financial aid may not be awarded to incoming freshmen or transfer students*), the member shall be transferred to the new division effective the September 1 that the institution selects as its effective date, *the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that membership election, multidivision classification and reclassification are effective September 1 of the year the applicant member meets the appropriate criteria, or the September 1 following the Convention if an active member institution seeks successfully a waiver of the criteria for multidivision classification or change of division membership, and that during the two-year compliance period, a member institution seeking Division III membership or reclassification of a sport to Division III may not award athletically related financial aid to incoming freshmen or transfer students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 75 FULL-TIME ASSISTANT COACHES—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 11.6.3.1, pages 54-55, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"11.6.3.1 Number Limits by Category

"11.6.3.1.1 Varsity Football Program. The following limits are applicable to a Division I-AA member institution that conducts a varsity football program only.

"Full-time assistant coaches 65

"11.6.3.1.2 Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program. The following limits are applicable to a Division I-AA member institution that conducts a football program that includes a varsity team and a freshman team.

"Full-time assistant coaches 65

"11.6.3.1.3 Varsity/Junior Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program. The following limits are applicable to a Division I-AA member institution that conducts a football program

that includes a varsity team, a junior varsity team and a freshman team.

"Full-time assistant coaches 65

"11.6.3.1.4 Varsity/Junior Varsity Football Program. The following limits are applicable to a Division I-AA member institution that conducts a football program that includes a varsity team and a junior varsity team.

"Full-time assistant coaches 65"

Source: All seven members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Intent: To reduce from six to five the total number of full-time assistant coaches in Division I-AA football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1991.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA.

NO. 76 MEN'S ICE HOCKEY COACHING STAFF LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend 11.6, pages 51-56, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.6 Limitations on the Number and Duties of Coaches

"The provisions of this section apply only to those sports that have adopted limitations related to the number and duties of coaches. They are.

"Football, Division I-A

"Football, Division I-AA

"Basketball, Division I

"Men's Ice Hockey, Division I

[11.6.1 through 11.6.4 unchanged.]

"11.6.5 Men's Ice Hockey

"11.6.5.1 Number Limits by Category

"Head coach 1

"Full-time assistant coaches 2

"Other coaches 1

"11.6.5.2 Weight or Strength Coach. No individual other than coaches designated in the coaching categories set forth in 11.6.5.1 may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any men's ice hockey game, practice or other organized activity except that a weight (strength or conditioning) coach may conduct flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches.

"11.6.5.3 Contact and Evaluation of Prospects Limited

to Full-Time Coaches. Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time head and assistant coaches may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus. The institution shall certify those individuals who fall within these number limitations and are thereby permitted to contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus."

Source: Boston College, Boston University, University of Lowell, University of Maine, Merrimack College, University of New Hampshire and two other member institutions.

Intent: In the sport of Division I men's ice hockey, to designate the number of permissible coaches, to identify the full-time coaches who may recruit and evaluate prospects off campus, and to specify that part-time assistant coaches are subject to the same compensation and remuneration limitations applicable to part-time coaches in other sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 77 SPORTS AND RULES COMMITTEES— COMPOSITION REQUIREMENTS

A. Bylaws: Amend 21.4.1.2, page 306, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.4.1.2 Composition Requirements. At least 25 percent of the positions on each rules committee shall be filled by athletics directors, **associate or assistant athletics directors**, senior women athletics administrators, individuals who are employed full-time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part-time as administrators by member conferences and full-time by member institutions. In order for a district to be represented, at least five of its active members shall sponsor the sport involved on an intercollegiate basis."

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.5.1.2, page 308, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.5.1.2 Composition Requirements. At least 25 percent of the positions on each committee shall be filled by athletics directors, **associate or assistant athletics directors**, senior women athletics administrators, individuals who are employed full-time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part-time as administrators by member conferences and full-time by member institutions. In order for a district to be represented on a committee for which district representation is specified, at least five of its active members shall sponsor the sport involved on an intercollegiate basis."

C. Bylaws: Amend 21.6.1.2, page 310, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.1.2 Composition Requirements. At least 25 percent of the positions on each sports committee shall be filled by athletics directors, **associate or assistant athletics directors**, senior women athletics administrators, individuals who are employed full-time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part-time as administrators by member conferences and full-time by member institutions."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Review and Planning, Council Subcommittee to Review Minority Opportunities in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Intent: To permit associate or assistant athletics directors to count toward the minimum requirements for administrators on sports and rules committees.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 78 DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend 21.6.5, page 311, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.5 Basketball Committee, Division I Men's. The Division I Men's Basketball Committee shall consist of nine representatives from Division I, including **two one** members from each of the four Division I men's basketball regions and **one five** selected at large. **No more than three committee members shall represent any single region.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Division I Men's Basketball Committee).

Intent: To specify that the membership of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee shall include at least one member from each of the four Division I men's basketball regions, that five members shall be selected at large and that no more than three committee members shall represent any single region.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 79 DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE

Constitution: Amend 21.6.7, page 311, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.7 Basketball Committee, Division II Men's. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee shall consist of **six eight** members."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Division II Men's Basketball Committee).

Intent: To increase from six to eight the membership of the Division II Men's Basketball Committee. [Estimated cost to the Association in 1989-90: \$3,000.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 80 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S FENCING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend 21 by deleting 21.5.2, page 308, and amending 21.6.11, page 311, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.11 Fencing Committee, **Men's and Women's**. The **Men's and Women's Fencing Committee** shall consist of ~~six~~ **eight** members, including three members from Division I, one member from Division II, one member from Division III and one member elected at large. **Four members shall represent men's fencing interests, including at least one representative from each of the four men's fencing regions. Four members shall represent women's fencing interests, including at least one representative from each of the four women's fencing regions.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Men's and Women's Fencing Committees).

Intent: To establish a combined Men's and Women's Fencing Committee with only championships administration responsibilities and to specify that the committee shall have eight members, including representatives of the men's and women's fencing interests from each of the four men's and women's fencing regions.

Effective Date: September 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by all divisions

NO. 81 DIVISION I MEN'S ICE HOCKEY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend 21.6.19, page 311, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.19 Ice Hockey Committee, Division I Men's. The Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of ~~four~~ **five** representatives from Division I, including two members from the East, comprising Districts 1, 2 and 3, and two members from the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, **and one Division I ice hockey conference commissioner.**"

Source: Brown University, Clarkson University, Colgate University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Miami University (Ohio) and six other member institutions.

Intent: To increase from four to five the membership of the Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee by requiring that one Division I ice hockey conference commissioner serve on that committee. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$1,500.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 82 RESOLUTION: JUNIOR COLLEGE RELATIONS COMMITTEE

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the community colleges, junior colleges and technical colleges of the United States (two-year colleges) serve more than eight million students each year; and

"Whereas, more than 100,000 of these students are classified as student-athletes who participate in the intercollegiate athletics programs of the two-year colleges; and

"Whereas, one of the stated educational goals of the student-athlete at a two-year college is to transfer academically and athletically to a four-year university or college; and

"Whereas, it is the assigned task of the two-year colleges to prepare student-athletes academically, as well as athletically, to take the appropriate step from the two-year institution to the four-year institution; and

"Whereas, two-year college academic advisers, faculty, coaches and staff need to be thoroughly knowledgeable about NCAA rules and regulations; and

"Whereas, it is in the best interests of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and two-year college representatives to communicate with one another to enhance the opportunity for student-athletes to make a smooth academic transition from one college level to another, and

"Whereas, it is important that each amateur governing body (NCAA, National Junior College Athletic Association, California Association of Community Colleges and Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges) share this goal;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council establish a committee to examine the relationship between the NCAA and the two-year college sports governing bodies regarding the matriculation of student-athletes from one academic environment to another; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the committee shall develop ways to increase communication between the sports governing bodies so that the opportunity for student-athletes to matriculate easily from two-year colleges to NCAA institutions is enhanced; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the committee shall complete its findings by August 1990, with recommendations or legislation to strengthen the relationships and communications between the sports governing associations for the benefit of the involved student-athletes."

Source: All 12 members of the Big West Conference. [Estimated cost to the Association: \$6,000.]

Action: Approved.

Amateurism

NO. 83 BROKEN-TIME PAYMENTS

- A. Bylaws: Amend 12.4.2.4 by adding new 12.4.2.4.1, page 63, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.4.2.4.1 Exception When Individual Not Enrolled in Regular Term. An individual may receive broken-time payments administered by the United States Olympic Committee or the national governing body in the sport during a period when the individual is not enrolled (full or part time) in a regular term to cover financial loss as a result of absence from employment as a direct result of practicing and competing on a national team (defined in 14.02.7), provided the amounts are consistent with the principles set forth in 12.4.1 and do not exceed \$250 per week, and the payment period covers no more than the period from the date the individual begins practice with the national team following selection to that team to one week after the conclusion of the competition."

- B. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.1.1 by adding new 16.11.1.1.1, page 165, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.11.1.1.1 Exception When Student-Athlete Not Enrolled in Regular Term. A student-athlete may receive broken-time payments administered by the United States Olympic Committee or the national governing body in the sport during a period when the student-athlete is not enrolled (full or part time) in a regular term to cover financial loss as a result of absence from employment as a direct result of practicing and competing on a national team (defined in 14.02.7), provided the amounts are consistent with the principles set forth in 12.4.1 and do not exceed \$250 per week, and the payment period covers no more than the period from the date the student-athlete begins practice with the national team following selection to that team to one week after the conclusion of the competition."

- C. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.2.3, page 165, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.11.2.3 'Broken-Time' Payments. The receipt by a student-athlete of compensation for a financial loss resulting from absence from employment (i.e., 'broken-time' payments) during any period other than immediately prior to and including Olympic participation, or the receipt of such payments administered by a sports governing body independent of the USOC except as permitted in 12.4.2.4.1, 16.11.1.1 and 16.11.1.1.1, is prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues).

Intent: To permit individuals not enrolled (full or part time) in a regular term to receive broken-time payments not to exceed \$250 per week from the U.S. Olympic Committee or the national governing body in the sport to compensate the individual for lost employment earnings resulting from participation on a national team without jeopardizing the individual's eligibility for intercollegiate athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 84 FORMS OF PAY—U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE INSURANCE PROGRAM

- A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.2 by adding new 12.1.2.3, page 59, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.2.3 Exception for USOC Elite Athlete Health Insurance Program. An individual may receive the comprehensive benefits of the USOC Elite Athlete Health Insurance Program."

- B. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.1 by adding new 16.11.1.2, page 165, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.11.1.2 Exception for USOC Elite Athlete Health Insurance Program. An individual may receive the comprehensive benefits of the USOC Elite Athlete Health Insurance Program."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues).

Intent: To permit individuals to receive the full benefits of the Elite Athlete Health Insurance Program established by the U.S. Olympic Committee without jeopardizing their eligibility for intercollegiate athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 85 ACTUAL AND NECESSARY EXPENSES—EQUIPMENT AND APPAREL

- A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.2, page 58, as follows.

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.2 Forms of Pay. An individual loses amateur status through receipt of 'pay,' which includes, but is not limited to, the following practices:

[12.1.2-(a) through 12.1.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Expenses received from an outside amateur sports team or organization in excess of actual and necessary travel, room

and board expenses, and apparel and equipment (for individual and team use only from teams or organizations not affiliated with member institutions, including local sports clubs as set forth in 13.11.2.4) for practice and game competition."

[Remainder of 12.1.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.1.3, page 165, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.11.1.3 Outside Sports Teams. An amateur outside sports team or organization may provide actual and necessary expenses to team members only if the expenses are:

"(a) A reasonable amount for travel and meal expenses, and apparel and equipment (for individual and team use only from teams or organizations not affiliated with member institutions, including local sports clubs as set forth in 13.11.2.4),"

[Remainder of 16.11.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues).

Intent: To permit individuals to receive from amateur sports teams or organizations (other than those specifically affiliated with member institutions) apparel and equipment for individual and team use, for practice and competition, without affecting their eligibility for intercollegiate athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 86 PERMISSIBLE AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend 16.1.2 and 16.1.3, page 154, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.1.2 Permissible Awards

"16.1.2.1 Insignia and Personalization. All awards except those prior to enrollment (see 16.1.1.1) and when the student-athlete is not regularly enrolled (see 16.1.1.3) must include an appropriate institutional insignia or letter, event specification, or comparable identification. Merchandise or appliance items may not be utilized unless they are specifically authorized and properly personalized

"16.1.2.2 Specific Awards Permitted. Student-athletes may receive the following or similar awards (with institutional insignia or proper personalization as required by 16.1.2.1) without jeopardizing their intercollegiate athletics eligibility (see 16.1.3 for prohibited awards):

binoculars	jackets	rings
blankets	luggage	scrolls
blazers	pen and pencil sets	sweaters
cameras	photographs	trophies
clock radios	plaques	watches

[16.1.2.3, renumbered as 16.1.2.2, unchanged.]

"16.1.3 Nonpermissible Awards. The following awards are prohibited unless received per 16.1.1.1 or 16.1.1.3, except that receipt of a cash award is not permitted under any circumstances.

[16.1.3.1 unchanged.]

"16.1.3.2 Merchandise. Gift certificates, appliances, television sets and other merchandise items that cannot be properly personalized shall be prohibited."

[Remainder of 16.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Intent: To specify that all properly personalized items, including personalized merchandise items, may be awarded to student-athletes within the Association's awards limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 87 TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN TERMS

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2 by adding new 16.8.1.2.2, page 163, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.2.2 Transportation for Competition Occurring Between Terms. It is permissible for any athletics department staff member to furnish transportation to eligible student-athletes to the campus from the nearest bus or train station or major airport pursuant to practice and/or team travel relating to competition that occurs between the end of a final examination period of the fall semester (or fall or winter quarters) and the beginning of the following regular term."

Source: University of Colorado; Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Missouri, Columbia, and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit athletics department staff members to provide local transportation for student-athletes returning to campus for competition during midterm vacation periods.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990

Action: Approved.

NO. 88 ACADEMIC AWARDS BANQUET

Bylaws: Amend 16.1.6 by adding new 16.1.6.3, page 157, renumbering subsequent section, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.1.6.3 Academic Awards Banquet—All Sports. An institution may conduct an annual academic awards or recognition banquet or meeting to honor members of its inter-

collegiate athletics teams for academic achievements. The following regulations shall apply to such an event:

- "(a) It is held to commemorate the academic accomplishments of individual student-athletes,
- "(b) It is conducted by and subject to the control of the member institution,
- "(c) It is held within 100 miles of the institution's main campus and within the same state,
- "(d) Only one such event is held per year,
- "(e) Any award presented to a student-athlete must conform with the restriction set forth in 16.1.4.1.3, and
- "(f) Only the institution or representatives of its athletics interests (through the institution) may provide expenses for the event."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi, and one other member institution

Intent: To permit member institutions to conduct an annual banquet or meeting to honor student-athletes for academic achievements, and to permit an award that conforms to 16.1.4.1.3 (i.e., \$100 limit) in conjunction with such a banquet.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 89 ACADEMIC AWARDS BANQUET

Bylaws: Amend 16.1.6, page 157, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.1.6 Institutional Awards Banquets. An institution (and in the case of the recognition banquet specified in 16.1.6.4, its booster club) may conduct a maximum of three of the four awards banquets specified in this section.

[16.1.6.1 and 16.1.6.2 unchanged.]

"16.1.6.3 Academic Awards Banquet—All Sports. An institution may conduct an annual all-sports banquet or meeting to honor selected scholar-athletes on its intercollegiate athletics teams. The following regulations shall apply to such an event:

- "(a) It is held to commemorate the academic accomplishments of teams and individual student-athletes,
- "(b) It is conducted by and subject to the control of the member institution,
- "(c) It is held within 100 miles of the institution's main campus and within the same state,
- "(d) Only one such event is held per year, and

"(e) Only the institution or representatives of its athletics interests (through the institution) may provide expenses for the event."

[16.1.6.3, renumbered as 16.1.6.4, unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To permit member institutions to conduct an annual banquet or meeting to honor student-athletes for academic achievements, and to specify that member institutions may conduct a maximum of three banquets per year from among the four available banquet opportunities.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn

Playing Seasons

NO. 90 CONDITIONING PROGRAMS

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.12.1, pages 171-172, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"17.02.12.1 Activities Not Considered Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice shall not be considered to have occurred in the following activities:

[17.02.12.1-(a) and 17.02.12.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Voluntary participation by student-athletes in weight-training or conditioning programs utilizing the institution's facilities outside the institution's established playing season in a sport, provided such activities are supervised only by members of the institution's strength and conditioning staff or, in the sport of Division I-A football, athletics trainers, who perform such duties on a department-wide basis, and further, in Division III, provided the supervision is available to students generally."

[17.02.12.1-(d) through (f) unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi, and two other member institutions

Intent: In the sport of Division I-A football, to permit athletics trainers with department-wide responsibilities to supervise the voluntary participation of student-athletes in off-season weight-training or conditioning programs.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I-A.

NO. 91 HERITAGE BOWL

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.4 and 17.7.5, pages 200-202, as follows:
[Division I-AA football only]

"17.7.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

[17.7.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(h) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, and International Competition, and **Heritage Bowl**. One post-season game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; international competition approved by the NCAA Council (by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting), or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. **In Division I-AA only, a member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between the conference champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference.**

[17.7.4.1 unchanged.]

"17.7.5 Number of Contests

[17.7.5.1 unchanged.]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) through 17.7.5.2-(m) unchanged.]

"(n) **Heritage Bowl. Participation in the Heritage Bowl held between the conference champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference.**"

Source: All nine members of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and all eight members of the Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit the champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and Southwestern Athletic Conference to participate in the Heritage Bowl, in addition to their participation in the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship, and to exclude participation in the Heritage Bowl from limitations governing the end of the playing season and the permissible number of contests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA.

NO. 92 ORIENTATION PERIOD—DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.2.2, page 199, as follows:
[Division II football only]

"17.7.2.2 Orientation Period—First-Time Participants. A member of Division I-A, or I-AA or II may establish an orientation period to commence four days prior to the start of preseason football practice for those student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility for football practice at the institution."

[Remainder of 17.7.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: All 14 members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit members of Division II to conduct a football orientation period for first-time participants in the sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 95 ICE HOCKEY STARTING DATE—DIVISION I

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.3-(a), page 210, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(a) Division I—The *second* **third** Friday in October."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee).

Intent: To move the date upon which an institution may play its first Division I ice hockey contest from the second to the third Friday in October.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn

NO. 96 CONTEST LIMITATIONS—DIVISION I BASEBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.4.2, pages 179-180, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.2.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of baseball contests shall exclude the following:

[17.2.4.2-(a) through 17.2.4.2-(j) unchanged.]

"(k) **ABCA Hall of Fame Benefit Tournament—Division I. Competition in the American Baseball Coaches Association Hall of Fame Benefit Tournament (not to exceed two contests).**"

[17.2.4.2-(k) through 17.2.4.2-(m), relettered as 17.2.4.2-(l) through 17.2.4.2-(n), unchanged.]

Source: All six members of the American South Conference and six other member institutions.

Intent: To exempt the participation of a Division I member institution's baseball team in the American Baseball Coaches Association Hall of Fame Benefit Tournament from numerical contest limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 97 DIVISION II BASEBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.2, pages 178-182, as follows:
[Division II only]

"17.2 BASEBALL

"Regulations for computing the baseball playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

"17.2.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in baseball shall be limited to the following:

[17.2.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division II—A maximum of 26 weeks **during the academic year.**

[17.2.1-(c) and 17.2.2 through 17.2.4 unchanged.]

"17.2.5 Out-of-Season Practice. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff in the sport of baseball shall not engage in organized practice activities outside the institution's declared baseball season per 17.2.1.

"17.2.5.1 Summer Practice

"17.2.5.1.1 Divisions I and II. No limitations; however, an institution may provide expenses for baseball practice sessions during the summer vacation period only when the student-athlete(s) report for regular squad practice under the following circumstances:

[17.2.5.1.1-(a) and 17.2.5.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.2.5.1.2 Divisions II and III. Baseball practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council.

[Remainder of 17.2.5 and 17.2.6 unchanged.]

"17.2.7 Other Restrictions

[17.2.7.1 unchanged.]

"17.2.7.2 Out-of-Season, Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition. A member institution may permit no more than the following number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining in intercollegiate baseball to practice or compete

out of season on an outside, amateur baseball team:
[17.2.7.2-(a) and 17.2.7.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.2.7.2.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff—Divisions I and II. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I or II institution may be involved in any way (e.g., coach, official) during the academic year with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's baseball team.

"17.2.7.2.2 Involvement of Coaching Staff—Divisions II and III. No member of the coaching staff of a Division II or III institution may be involved in any way (e.g., coach, official) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's baseball team."

[Remainder of 17.2.7 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To limit the application of the 26-week playing-season limitation in Division II baseball to the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II. Later motion to reconsider approved; then approved again, 91-59.

NO. 98 DIVISION III BASEBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.2, pages 178-182, as follows:
[Division III only]

"17.2 BASEBALL

"Regulations for computing the baseball playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

"17.2.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in baseball shall be limited to the following:

[17.2.1-(a) and 17.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Division III—A maximum of 21 weeks **during the academic year.**

[17.2.2 through 17.2.4 unchanged.]

"17.2.5 Out-of-Season Practice. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff in the sport of baseball shall not engage in organized practice activities outside the institution's declared baseball season per 17.2.1.

"17.2.5.1 Summer Practice

"17.2.5.1.1 Divisions I and III. No limitations; however, an institution may provide expenses for baseball practice sessions during the summer vacation period only when the student-athlete(s) report for regular squad practice under the following circumstances:

[17.2.5.1.1-(a) and 17.2.5.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.2.5.1.2 Divisions II and III. Baseball practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council.

[Remainder of 17.2.5 and 17.2.6 unchanged.]

"17.2.7 Other Restrictions

[17.2.7.1 unchanged.]

"17.2.7.2 Out-of-Season, Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition. A member institution may permit no more than the following number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining in intercollegiate baseball to practice or compete out of season on an outside, amateur baseball team:

[17.2.7.2-(a) and 17.2.7.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.2.7.2.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff—Divisions I and III. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I or III institution may be involved in any way (e.g., coach, official) during the academic year with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's baseball team.

"17.2.7.2.2 Involvement of Coaching Staff—Divisions II and III. No member of the coaching staff of a Division II or III institution may be involved in any way (e.g., coach, official) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's baseball team."

[Remainder of 17.2.7 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Wisconsin State University Conference.

Intent: To limit the application of the 21-week playing-season limitation in Division III baseball to the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 98—1 DIVISION III BASEBALL

Amend Proposal No. 98, 17.2.5.1, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.2.5.1 Summer Practice

"17.2.5.1.1 Divisions I and III. No limitations; however, an institution may provide expenses for baseball practice sessions during the summer vacation period only when the student-athlete(s) report for regular squad practice under the following circumstances:

[17.2.5.1.1-(a), 17.2.5.1.1-(b) and 17.2.5.1.2 unchanged.]

"17.2.5.1.3 Division III. No limitations; however, an institution may not provide expenses for baseball practice sessions during the summer vacation period."

Source: All nine members of the Wisconsin State University Conference.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 99 DIVISION I SOFTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.15, pages 226-230, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.15 SOFTBALL

"Regulations for computing the softball playing season are set forth in 17.1. General Playing-Season Regulations.

"17.15.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in softball shall be limited to the following.

"(a) Division I—A maximum of 26 weeks during the academic year.

"(a) (b) Divisions I and II—A maximum of 26 weeks.

[17.15.1-(b), relettered as 17.15.1-(c), and 17.15.2 through 17.15.4 unchanged.]

"17.15.5 Out-of-Season Practice. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff in the sport of softball shall not engage in organized practice activities outside the institution's declared softball playing season per 17.15.1.

"17.15.5.1 Summer Practice.

"17.15.5.1.1 Division I. No limitations; however, an institution may provide expenses for softball practice sessions during the summer vacation period only when the student-athlete(s) report for regular squad practice under the following circumstances:

"(a) The sessions are announced by the institution through a member of its athletics department staff prior to the beginning of any quarter or semester, and

"(b) The sessions involve the entire softball team.

"17.15.5.1.2 Divisions II and III. Softball practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council.

[17.15.5.2 and 17.15.6 unchanged.]

"17.15.7 Other Restrictions

[17.15.7.1 unchanged.]

"17.15.7.2 Out-of-Season. Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition. A member institution may permit no more than the following number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining in intercollegiate softball to practice or compete out of season on an outside, amateur softball team:

"(1) Division I—4 (during the academic year).

"(2) Divisions II and III—No limitations.

"17.15.7.2.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff—Division I. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I institution may be involved in any way (e.g., coach, official) during the academic year with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's softball team.

"17.15.7.2.2 Involvement of Coaching Staff—Divisions II and III. No member of the coaching staff of a member institution may be involved in any way (e.g., coach, official) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's softball team."

[Remainder of 17.15.7 and 17.15.8 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Women's Softball Committee).

Intent: To limit the application of the 26-week playing-season limitation in Division I softball to the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 100 WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

Bylaws: Amend 17.19, pages 243-247, as follows.

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.19 VOLLEYBALL

"Regulations for computing the volleyball playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

[17.19.1 unchanged.]

"17.19.2 Preseason Practice—Women.

"17.19.2.1 First Practice Date. A member institution shall not commence official preseason volleyball practice sessions in the traditional segment for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team prior to the following dates:

"(a) Traditional Segment—For all divisions, the date that will permit a maximum of 29 'practice opportunities' prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate date of competition.

"(b) Nontraditional Segment—For all divisions, January 1.

"17.19.2.1.1 Computation of 'Practice Opportunities.' In determining the number of 'practice opportunities' in the sport of women's volleyball pursuant to 17.19.2.1, Sundays are excluded from the counting; but otherwise there shall be counted one for each day beginning with the opening of classes, one for each day classes are not in session in the week of the first scheduled intercollegiate match and two for each other day in the preseason practice period.

"17.19.2.1.1.1 'Week.' The 'week' of the first scheduled intercollegiate match is defined as the six days, excluding Sunday, preceding the date of competition (even if several of the days fall into different traditional calendar weeks).

"17.19.2.1.1.2 Opening Day of Classes. Required freshman orientation is not considered to be the opening day of classes for the academic year.

"17.19.3 First Date of Competition—Women.

"17.19.3.1 Traditional Segment. For all divisions, September 1 (or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday).

"17.19.3.2 Nontraditional Segment. For all divisions—January 1.

"17.19.2 17.19.4 Preseason Practice and First Date of Competition—Men. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in volleyball or play its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in volleyball prior to the following dates:

"17.19.2.1 17.19.4.1 Traditional Segment

[17.19.2.1-(a) and 17.19.2.1-(b), renumbered as 17.19.4.1-(a) and 17.19.4.1-(b), unchanged.]

"(c) Division III—

[17.19.2.1-(c)-(1), renumbered as 17.19.4.1-(c)-(1), unchanged.]

"(2) Women—August 15."

[17.19.2.2, renumbered as 17.19.4.2, unchanged; 17.19.3 through 17.19.8, renumbered as 17.19.5 through 17.19.10, unchanged.]

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of New Haven; New Mexico State University; University of the Pacific; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Texas, Austin, and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit a starting date for preseason practice in women's volleyball that will be calculated on the basis of providing a

maximum of 29 "practice opportunities" prior to the institution's first scheduled intercollegiate match, and to specify that the first permissible date of competition in women's volleyball shall be September 1 during the traditional segment and January 1 during the nontraditional segment.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 101 SEASON-ENDING VOLLEYBALL TOURNAMENT

Bylaws: Amend 17.19.4.2, pages 244-246, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.19.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of volleyball shall exclude the following:

[17.19.4.2-(a) and 17.19.4.2-(b) unchanged; 17.19.4.2-(c) and 17.19.4.2-(d) deleted.]

"(c) Competition in one season-ending volleyball tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship, Women's Invitational Volleyball Championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season."

[17.19.4.2-(e) through 17.19.4.2-(m), relettered as 17.19.4.2-(d) through 17.19.4.2-(l), unchanged.]

Source: Eastern Kentucky University; Illinois State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of the Pacific; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Texas, Austin, and three other member institutions.

Intent: To exempt participation in one season-ending tournament [in addition to the conference championship or conference play-off currently exempted per 17.19.11.2-(a) and 17.19.4.2-(b)] from the maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of volleyball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 102 SEASON-ENDING FENCING TOURNAMENT

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.4.2, pages 192-193, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.5.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of fencing shall exclude the following:

"(a) Conference Championship Season-Ending Tournament. Competition in one conference championship meet in season-ending fencing tournament (e.g., conference championship, re-

gional tournament) other than an NCAA fencing championship;"

[Remainder of 17.5.4.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Men's and Women's Fencing Committees).

Intent: To exempt participation in one season-ending tournament (e.g., conference championship, regional tournament) other than an NCAA fencing championship from the maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of fencing.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 103 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend 17.17.5.2, pages 237-238, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.17.5.2 Division III. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff in Division III in the sport of tennis shall not engage in organized team practice activities outside the institution's declared tennis playing season per 17.17.1."

[Remainder of 17.17.5.2 unchanged.]

Source: Brandeis University, Luther College, Mary Washington College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Regis College (Massachusetts), Simmons College and four other member institutions.

Intent: To permit individual, voluntary instruction between Division III student-athletes and coaches outside the established 21-week playing season in the sport of tennis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division III, 84-152

Recruiting

NO. 104 PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE

Bylaws: Amend 13.02.8 and 13.02.9, page 71, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.02.8 Prospective Student-Athlete. A prospective student-athlete ('prospect') is a student who has started classes for the ninth grade and has been recruited by any institutional staff member or representative of the institution's athletics interests (as defined in 13.02.10). In addition, a student who has not started classes for the ninth grade becomes a prospective student-athlete if the institution provides such an individual (or the individual's relatives or friends) any financial assistance or other benefits that the institution does not provide to prospective students generally. Actions by staff members or athletics representatives that cause a

prospective student to become a prospective student-athlete include, but are not limited to, the following:

[13.02.8-(a) through 13.02.8-(e) deleted.]

"13.02.9 Recruiting. Recruiting is any solicitation of the prospect or the prospect's family (or guardian) by an institutional staff member or by a representative of the institution's athletics interests for the purpose of securing the prospect's enrollment and ultimate participation in the institution's intercollegiate athletics program.

"13.02.9.1 Activities Constituting Recruitment. Actions by staff members or athletics representatives that cause a prospective student to become a recruited prospective student-athlete include, but are not limited to, the following:

"(a) Providing transportation to the prospect to visit the institution's campus;

"(b) Entertaining the prospect in any way on the campus, except the institution may provide a complimentary admission to an on-campus athletics contest in which its team competes when the prospect visits the institution as a member of a group tour;

"(c) Initiating or arranging a telephone contact with the prospect, family member or guardian for the purpose of recruitment;

"(d) Visiting a prospect, family member or guardian for the purpose of recruitment, or

"(e) Entertaining family members or guardians of a prospect on the institution's campus."

"13.02.9.1 13.02.9.2 Activities Not Constituting Recruitment. Recruitment is not considered to have occurred if:

[13.02.9.1-(a) deleted; 13.02.9.1-(b) through 13.02.9.1-(d), renumbered as 13.02.9.2-(a) through 13.02.9.2-(c), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To clarify for purposes of NCAA recruiting legislation the distinction between a prospective student-athlete and a recruited prospective student-athlete by specifying that a prospective student-athlete (as opposed to a recruited prospective student-athlete) is any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade and by specifying that a prospective student-athlete shall become a recruited prospective student-athlete if the institution provides the individual (or the individual's relatives or friends) any financial aid or other benefits that the institution does not provide to prospective students generally.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 105 OFFICIAL ACT AND SAT SCORES

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.9.1, page 71, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.02.9.1 Activities Not Constituting Recruitment. Recruitment is not considered to have occurred if:

[13.02.9.1-(a) through 13.02.9.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) The institution pays a fee required by the appropriate testing agency to obtain a prospect's official ACT or SAT scores."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.15 by adding new 13.15.2, page 99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.15.2 Permissible Expense—ACT and SAT Scores. An institution may pay a fee required by the appropriate testing agency to obtain a prospect's official ACT or SAT scores."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To permit a Division I or II member institution to pay a fee required by the appropriate testing agency to obtain a report of a prospect's official ACT or SAT scores without the payment constituting the recruitment of the prospect or an impermissible precollege expense.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 106 FOOTBALL RECRUITING CONTACTS— DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, pages 80-81, as follows.

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.1.4 Permissible Number of Contacts. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent:

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution. In sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, not more than three contacts per prospect shall be allowed at the prospect's educational institution. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, one contact per prospect is permitted each week of the contact period on the occasion of the once-a-week visit. The All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative of the prospect's

educational institution, and"
[Remainder of 13.1.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, to eliminate the current limit of three contacts per prospect at the prospect's educational institution, thereby permitting a member institution's football coaching staff members to visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during each week of the appropriate contact period.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA. Division I-AA first defeated the proposal, 44-47; later approved it after successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 107 CONTACT AND EVALUATION PERIODS— DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.5, page 78, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.1.3.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through October 31 Quiet Period

[except for (b) below]:

"(b) Fridays during the month of Evaluation Period
October:

[13.1.3.5-(b), relettered as 13.1.3.5-(c), unchanged.]

"(c)(d) December 1 through Contact Period
December 23:

"(e) December 24 through Dead Period
January 1:

"(f) January 2 through the Saturday Contact Period
following the initial date for the
signing of the National Letter of
Intent [except for (d) (g) and (e) (h)
below]:

[13.1.3.5-(d) through 13.1.3.5-(f), relettered as 13.1.3.5-(g)
through 13.1.3.5-(i), unchanged.]

"(g)(j) Fifteen consecutive days Evaluation Period
during May 1 through May 31
selected at the discretion of
the member institution and
designated in writing in the
office of the director of
athletics:

"(k) Those days in May not Quiet Period"
designated in (j) above
for evaluation opportunities:

Source: Brigham Young University; University of Colorado; Colorado State University; University of Kentucky; University of Missouri, Columbia, and University of Texas, Austin.

Intent: To add Fridays during October to the evaluation period in Divisions I-A and I-AA football, to establish the period from December 24 through January 1 as a dead period, and to limit the evaluation period during the month of May to 15 consecutive days designated in writing by the member institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA. Proposal first was withdrawn; later moved. Division I-A approved, 61-45; later motion to reconsider in I-A was defeated, 43-64. Division I-AA first defeated the proposal; later approved it after successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 108 EVALUATION PERIODS—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.5, page 78, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.1.3.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through October 31 Quiet Period

[except for (b) below]:

"(b) Fridays during the month of Evaluation Period
September and October:

[13.1.3.5-(b) through 13.1.3.5-(f), relettered as 13.1.3.5-(c)
through 13.1.3.5-(g), unchanged.]

"(g)(h) May 1 through May 31: Evaluation Period

"(i) May 23 through May 31: Quiet Period"

Source: All eight members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To add Fridays during September and October as a permissible evaluation period in Divisions I-A and I-AA football and to reduce the length of the May evaluation period by nine days.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

NO. 109 WOMEN'S BASKETBALL EVALUATIONS

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.2.2, page 77, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.3.2.2 Limitation on Number of Basketball Evaluations. Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled at the same institution. In addition, institutional staff members shall not observe more than three women's basketball contests in which a prospect competes during any

academic year. Observing a contest shall count as one of the three permissible observations for each prospect on both teams, except that observation of any tournament, including the NJCAA or AAU women's national basketball championship, shall count as a single observation if it occurs during the academic year. All competition that occurs on consecutive days within a tournament (and normally at the same site) or that involves a tier of a tournament (e.g., regional) shall count as a single observation."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To limit Division I member institutions' women's basketball staff members to not more than one visit per week to a prospect's educational institution during an evaluation period, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled at the institution

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 110 EVALUATION PERIODS—DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.2, pages 76-77, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.3.2 Basketball, Division I Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division I:

[13.1.3.2-(a) through 13.1.3.2-(w) unchanged.]

"(x) In the states of Michigan, West Virginia, *Montana* and South Dakota, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and between November 20 and December 10

"(y) In the states of Virginia and **Montana**, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and between November 2 and November 22."

[Remainder of 13.1.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Big Sky Conference.

Intent: To change the permissible dates for the evaluation of prospects in the state of Montana by Division I women's basketball coaching staff members.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 111 MEN'S ICE HOCKEY RECRUITING PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2 and 13.1.3, pages 72-79, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.2 Permissible Recruiters

[13.1.2.1 through 13.1.2.5 unchanged.]

"13.1.2.6 Football, *and* Basketball and **Men's Ice Hockey, Division I** In the sports of football, *and* basketball and **men's ice hockey** in Division I, only those coaches who are counted among the numerical limitations on full-time coaches, in accordance with 11.6, may recruit or evaluate prospects off campus.

"13.1.2.6.1 Written Certification. A member institution shall certify in writing and have on file a list of those football, *and* basketball and **men's ice hockey** coaches who are permitted to recruit or evaluate prospects off campus.

"13.1.2.6.2 Department-Wide Responsibilities. An athletics department staff member who has department-wide responsibilities (e.g., recruiting coordinator) may not recruit or evaluate prospects off campus in the sports of football, *or* basketball **or men's ice hockey** unless the staff member is counted as a full-time coach in that sport (see 11.6.1.1.1.1).

[13.1.2.7 through 13.1.2.9 unchanged.]

"13.1.3 Recruiting Calendars

[13.1.3.1 through 13.1.3.6 unchanged.]

"13.1.3.7 **Men's Ice Hockey, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to men's ice hockey in Division I:**

"(a) **July 10 through July 24:** Evaluation Period

"(b) **July 25 through August 9:** Quiet Period

"(c) **August 10 through August 24:** Evaluation Period

"(d) **August 25 through the last** Quiet Period

Thursday in September:

"(e) **The last Friday in September** Contact Period
through the third Friday in
October:

"(f) **The third Saturday in October** Quiet Period
through the fourth Thursday
in November:

"(g) **The fourth Friday in** Contact Period
November through the
second Tuesday in December:

"(h) **The second Wednesday in** Quiet Period
December through
December 26:

"(i) **December 27 through** Evaluation Period
December 31:

"(j) **January 1 and January 2:** Quiet Period

"(k) **January 3 through** Evaluation Period
January 16:

- "(l) January 17 through the last Thursday in February: **Quiet Period**
- "(m) The last Friday in February through the first Saturday in March: **Contact Period**
- "(n) The first Sunday in March through May 15 [except for (p) and (q) below]: **Quiet Period**
- "(o) During the period 48 hours prior to 8 a.m. on the initial date for signing the National Letter of Intent: **Dead Period**
- "(p) The four days immediately preceding the finals of the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship: **Contact Period**
- "(q) The three days during the finals of the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship: **Dead Period**
- "(r) May 16 through May 21: **Evaluation Period**
- "(s) May 22 through July 9: **Quiet Period**
- "13.1.3.7 13.1.3.8 Banquets and Meetings. A member of the basketball, or football or men's ice hockey coaching staff may speak at a meeting or banquet outside the recruiting periods (see 13.02.4.4), provided:
[13.1.3.7-(a) and 13.1.3.7-(b), renumbered as 13.1.3.8-(a) and 13.1.3.8-(b), unchanged; 13.1.3.8, renumbered as 13.1.3.9, unchanged.]
- "13.1.3.9 13.1.3.10 There are no specified contact and evaluation periods in sports other than football, and basketball and men's ice hockey except for the following dead periods:"
[13.1.3.9.1 and 13.1.3.9.2, renumbered as 13.1.3.10.1 and 13.1.3.10.2, unchanged; 13.1.3.9.3 deleted; 13.1.3.9.4 and 13.1.3.9.5, renumbered as 13.1.3.10.3 and 13.1.3.10.4, unchanged.]

Source: Boston College, Boston University, University of Lowell, University of Maine, Merrimack College, University of New Hampshire and two other member institutions.

Intent: To specify permissible contact and evaluation periods and to identify the full-time coaches [see Proposal No. 76] who may recruit and evaluate prospects off campus in Division I men's ice hockey

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 112 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Amend 13.3.1, page 83, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.3.1 Divisions I and II—Permissible Items. Divisions I and II institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospects and to high school and two-year college coaches:

[13.3.1-(a) through 13.3.1-(k) unchanged.]

"(l) *Weight-lifting program information, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent* **Any necessary preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been officially accepted for enrollment by a member institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program."**

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities (e.g., playbooks) to prospects who have signed the National Letter of Intent or have been officially accepted for enrollment by a member institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II

NO. 113 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS—DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend 13.3.1, page 83, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.3.1 Divisions I and II—Permissible Items. Divisions I and II institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospects and to high school and two-year college coaches:

[13.3.1-(a) and 13.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) In Division II, one annual athletics press guide (with only one color of printing inside the covers) and one annual athletics recruiting brochure (with only one color of printing inside the covers);"

[Remainder of 13.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Communications Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the annual athletics recruiting brochure as a permissible recruiting item in Division II.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 114 RECRUITING CONTACTS—POST-HIGH SCHOOL

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4.3, page 81, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.4.3 Post-High School Contacts. The contact limitations set forth in this section apply separately to the period in which the prospect is enrolled in high school and the period beginning with the prospect's attendance in a college preparatory school or two-year college **October 15 following the prospect's completion of high school.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To specify that the contact limitations set forth in Bylaw 13.1.4 apply separately to the period in which a prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning with the October 15 following the prospect's completion of high school.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 115 POST-HIGH SCHOOL VISITS

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.1 3, page 86, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and III, divided vote]

"13.6.1.3 Post-High School Visits. The one-visit limitation in all divisions **Divisions I and III** and the limitations on total official visits in Divisions I and II apply separately to the period in which the prospect is in high school and to the period beginning *September 1* **October 15** following the prospect's completion of high school. **In Division II, the limitations apply separately to the period in which the prospect is in high school and to the period beginning September 1 following the prospect's completion of high school.** Thus, a prospect may be provided a maximum of 10 official visits—five while in high school and five beginning *September 1 after* **with the October 15 following the prospect's completion of high school in Divisions I and III or beginning September 1 following the prospect's completion of high school in Division II.**"

[Remainder of 13.6.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To specify that the numerical limitations associated with official visits set forth in Bylaw 13.6.1 apply separately in Divisions I and III to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning with the October 15 following the prospect's completion of high school.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and III (reference to Division III in final sentence editorially deleted).

NO. 116 OFFICIAL VISITS—PROSPECT'S ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.4, page 88, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.6.5.4 Student Host. The institution may provide the following to a student host entertaining a prospect:

"(a) A maximum of \$20 at a Division I member institution, or \$10 at a Division II or III member institution, for each day of the visit to cover *the* all actual costs of entertaining the prospect (and the prospect's parents, legal guardians or spouse), excluding the cost of meals and admission to campus events (i.e., those events produced or performed by the institution's faculty, staff or students). These funds may not be used for the purchase of souvenirs such as T-shirts or other institutional mementos. It is permissible to provide the student host with an additional \$10 (Division I) or \$5 (Divisions II and III) per day for each additional prospect the host entertains, and"

[13.6.5.4-(b) and 13.6.5.4.1 through 13.6.5.4.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To specify that the cost of all entertainment realized by a student host or provided a prospective student-athlete (and the prospect's parents, legal guardians or spouse) during an official visit, except for meals and campus events, shall be included in the \$20 (or \$10 for Divisions II and III) per day entertainment allowance provided the student host.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by Nos. 116—1 and 116—2.

NO. 116—1 OFFICIAL VISITS—PROSPECT'S ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Amend Proposal No. 116, 13.6.5.4, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.6.5.4 Student Host. The institution may provide the following to a student host entertaining a prospect:

"(a) A maximum of \$20 at a Division I member institution, or \$10 at a Division II or III member institution, for each day of the visit to cover all actual costs of entertaining the prospect (and the prospect's parents, legal guardians or spouse), excluding the cost of meals and admission to campus **athletics** events (i.e., those events produced or performed by the institution's faculty, staff or students). These funds may not be used for the purchase of souvenirs such as T-shirts or other institutional mementos. It is permissible to provide the student host with an additional \$10 (Division I) or \$5 (Divisions II or

III) per day for each additional prospect the host entertains, and"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 116—2 OFFICIAL VISITS—PROSPECT'S ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Amend Proposal No. 116, 13.6.5.4, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1990.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 117 OFFICIAL VISITS—STUDENT HOST ENTERTAINMENT ALLOWANCE

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.4, page 88, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"13.6.5.4 Student Host. The institution may provide the following to a student host entertaining a prospect:

"(a) A maximum of \$20 *at a Division I member institution, or \$10 at a Division II or III member institution,* for each day of the visit to cover the actual costs of entertaining the prospect. These funds may not be used for the purchase of souvenirs such as T-shirts or other institutional mementos. It is permissible to provide the student host with an additional \$10 *(Division I)* or \$5 *(Divisions II and III)* per day for each additional prospect the host entertains, and"

[13.6.5.4-(b) and 13.6.5.4.1 through 13.6.5.4.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To increase from \$10 to \$20 the daily entertainment allowance provided to student hosts entertaining prospective student-athletes on official visits at Divisions II and III institutions and to increase from \$5 to \$10 the additional daily allowance for each additional prospect the host entertains at Divisions II and III institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III as amended by No. 117—1.

NO. 117—1 OFFICIAL VISITS—STUDENT HOST ENTERTAINMENT ALLOWANCE

Amend Proposal No. 117, 13.6.5.4, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1990.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

NO. 118 CAMPUS ATHLETICS EVENTS—SPECIAL SEATING

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.2, page 88, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.6.5.2 Complimentary Admissions. During the official visit, complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event may be provided only to the prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse. **Such admissions may provide seating only in the general seating area of the facility utilized for conducting the event. Providing seating for the prospect or the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse in the facility's press box, special seating box(es) or bench area is specifically prohibited.**"

[Remainder of 13.6.5.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.2.1, pages 88-89, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.2.1 General Restrictions. During an official visit, the institution may not pay any expenses or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions (in Division I, issued only through a pass list) to a campus athletics event in which the institution's intercollegiate team competes. Such complimentary admissions are for the exclusive use of the prospect and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit and must be issued on an individual-game basis. **Such admissions may provide seating only in the general seating area of the facility utilized for conducting the event. Providing seating for the prospect or the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse in the facility's press box, special seating box(es) or bench is specifically prohibited.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that prospective student-athletes visiting Division I member institutions shall not be provided special seating (e.g., seating in press boxes, special seating boxes or bench areas) at campus athletics events.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 118—1.

NO. 118—1 CAMPUS ATHLETICS EVENTS—SPECIAL SEATING

Amend Proposal Nos. 118-A and 118-B, 13.6.5.2 and 13.7.2.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1990.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 119 OFFICIAL VISIT—ACT OR SAT SCORE

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.1.2 by adding new 13.6.1.2.3, page 86, as follows:
[Division I only]

"13.6.1.2.3 ACT or SAT Score. In the sports of Division I men's and women's basketball, a member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a prospective student-athlete who attends a high school in the United States (at the time of the visit) and who cannot present an ACT or SAT score achieved on a national testing date under national testing conditions."

Source: Bucknell University, Duke University, George Mason University, University of Maine, McNeese State University, Montana State University and six other member institutions.

Intent: To require a prospective student-athlete who attends high school in the United States to present an ACT or SAT score (achieved on a national testing date under national testing conditions) prior to the receipt of an expense-paid visit.

Effective Date: August 1, 1991.

Action: Defeated by Division I. Proposal first was not moved; later moved.

NO. 120 OFFICIAL VISITS—TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend 13.5.2, pages 85-86, as follows:
[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"13 5.2 Transportation on Official Paid Visit
[13.5.2.1 through 13.5.2.3 unchanged.]

"13.5.2.4 Transportation by Institutional Staff Members. In the sport of football, any member of an institution's athletics department may provide transportation for the prospect to and from the prospect's home or educational institution and the member institution."

[13.5.2.4 through 13 5.2.8, renumbered as 13.5.2.5 through 13.5.2.9, unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To permit any member of an institution's athletics department to provide transportation for a prospect in the sport of football to and from the prospect's home or educational institution in conjunction with an official visit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A and I-AA; determined to be inapplicable to Divisions II and III. Division I-AA first approved the proposal; later motion to rescind that approval was approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA voting together.

NO. 121 HIGH-SCHOOL CONTESTS—DIVISION III

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.1.3, page 92, as follows:
[Division III only]

"13 11.1.3 Competition in Conjunction With a High School, Preparatory School or Two-Year College. In the sports of basketball, football, gymnastics and volleyball, an Divisions I and II member institutions shall not permit competition between or among high schools, preparatory schools or two-year colleges to be conducted in conjunction with a collegiate athletics event (see 13.15.1.3). Division III member institutions shall be permitted to host such competition, provided all high schools, preparatory schools or two-year colleges involved are located within a 50-mile radius of the Division III member institution hosting the event and all such competition occurs on the member institution's campus."

"13 11.1.3.1 Criteria. An intercollegiate contest in Division I or II may be scheduled on the same day as a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college contest (without being considered to be scheduled 'in conjunction' with that event) only if the college and high-school, preparatory school or two-year college events are conducted in separate sessions, separate tickets are sold for the events, and the playing facility is cleared between the contests. A Division III member institution may schedule an intercollegiate contest on the same day as a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college contest under a single admission and conducted during a continuous session."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.15.1.3, page 98, as follows:
[Division III only]

"13 15.1.3 High-School Contest in Conjunction with College Competition A Division III member institution shall be permitted to host high-school contests in all sports held in conjunction with intercollegiate contests as specified in 13.11.1.3. A high-school contest held in conjunction with a Division I or II member institution's intercollegiate contest shall be governed by the following:"

[Remainder of 13.15 1.3 unchanged.]

Source: Drew University, Juniata College, King's College (Pennsylvania), Lycoming College, Susquehanna University and Wilkes College.

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions to host high-school, preparatory school or two-year college contests in all sports held in conjunction with intercollegiate contests, provided

all participating institutions are located within a 50-mile radius of the host institution and all competition occurs on the member institution's campus, and to exempt these contests from the pre-college expense restrictions set forth in 13.15.1.3.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 122 LOCAL SPORTS CLUBS

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2.4, page 93, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.2.4 Local Sports Clubs. An institution's coach may be involved as a participant or in instructional or coaching activities in the same sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospects participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 30 50-mile radius of the institution). Further, it is not permissible for the institution's coach to assign a prospect who lives outside the 30 50-mile area to another coach of the club."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To extend from 30 to 50 miles the permissible radius from campus in which a prospective student-athlete must be a legal resident to participate on a local sports club team involving a member institution's coach.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 123 TRYOUTS—DIVISION III RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2.3, page 93, as follows:

[Division III only]

"13.11.2.3 Recreational Activities. A prospect visiting a Division I or Division III institution may participate in physical workouts or other recreational activities during a visit to an institution's campus, provided such activities:

"(a) **In Division I only, do not** involve any sport for which the prospect is being recruited,"

[Remainder of 13.11.2.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit prospects to participate in recreational activities in any sport during a visit to a Division III institution's campus, provided such activities are not organized or observed by members of the athletics department coaching staff and are not designed to test the prospect's athletics abilities for recruiting purposes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 124 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES—SWIMMING

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2.3, page 93, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.2.3 Recreational Activities. A prospect visiting a *Division I or Division III* **member** institution may participate in physical workouts or other recreational activities during a visit to an institution's campus, provided such activities:

"(a) Do not involve any sport for which the prospect is being recruited, **with the exception of swimming;**

"(b) Are not organized or observed by members of the athletics department coaching staff, **and, in the case of swimming, by any swimming team members, and**"

[13.11.2.3-(c) unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Albion College; California State University, San Bernardino; Centre College; Ferris State University; Goucher College, and 16 other member institutions.

Intent: To permit a prospect in the sport of swimming to engage in a swimming workout during a paid or self-financed visit, provided no member of the athletics department coaching staff or any members of the swimming team organize or observe such a workout.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I, determined to be inapplicable to Division II, moot for Division III due to approval of No. 123.

NO. 125 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—RECRUITING OR SCOUTING SERVICES

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.3 by deleting 13.12.2.3.1 and amending 13.12.2.3.2, page 97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.2.3.2 **13.12.2.3.1** *Divisions II and III. In Divisions II and III, no* athletics department staff member may be employed (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) by a camp or clinic established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To prohibit (consistent with the current rule in Divisions II and III) all Division I athletics department staff members from being employed by or lecturing at a camp or clinic established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

**NO. 126 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—COACHING
STAFF EMPLOYMENT**

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.3.1, page 97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.2.3.1 Division I Football and Basketball—Employment Prohibitions. A member of a Division I institution's basketball coaching staff may not be employed by or lecture at a basketball camp established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services. **Further, a member institution's coaching staff members in the sports of Division I football and men's basketball may not be employed by (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) or lecture at a noninstitutional (i.e., privately owned) football or basketball camp.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To prohibit a member of a Division I institution's football or men's basketball coaching staff from being employed by or lecturing at a noninstitutional football or basketball camp.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 126—1.

**NO. 126—1 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—COACHING
STAFF EMPLOYMENT.**

Amend Proposal No. 126, 13.12.2.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.2.3.1 Division I Football and Basketball—Employment Prohibitions. A member of a Division I institution's basketball coaching staff may not be employed by or lecture at a basketball camp established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services. Further, a member institution's coaching staff members in the sports of Division I football and men's basketball may not be employed by (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) or lecture at a noninstitutional (i.e., privately owned) football or basketball camp **or clinic in which prospective student-athletes participate.**"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I.

**NO. 127 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—ADMISSIONS
AND EMPLOYMENT**

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.6 by deleting 13.12.1.6.1 and amending 13.12.1.6.2, page 95, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.1.6.2 **13.12.1.6.1** Divisions II and III. In operating a sports camp or clinic, an institution, members of its staff or a representative of its athletics interests shall not employ or give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade."

[13.12.1.6.3 and 13.12.1.6.4, renumbered as 13.12.1.6.2 and 13.12.1.6.3, unchanged]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To prohibit Division I member institutions' athletics department staff members or athletics representatives from employing or giving free or reduced admission privileges to any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade, rather than only those who also are athletics awards winners, consistent with the current rule applicable to Divisions II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I

NO. 128 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—DEFINITION

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1 by deleting 13.12.1.1 and amending 13.12.1.2, pages 94-95, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.1.2 **13.12.1.1 Definition** Division II and III. An institution's sports camp or instructional clinic shall be any camp or clinic that is owned or operated by a member institution or an employee of the member institution's athletics department, either on or off its campus."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To apply in Division I sports the same definition of an institution's sports camp or instructional clinic that applies to Divisions II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 128—1.

**NO. 128—1 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—
DEFINITION**

Amend Proposal No. 128, 13.12.1.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.1.1 Definition. An institution's sports camp or instructional clinic shall be any camp or clinic that is owned or operated by a member institution or an employee of the member institution's athletics department, either on or off its campus, **and in which prospective student-athletes participate.**"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference

Action: Approved by Division I.

**NO. 129 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—PERMISSIBLE
TIME PERIOD**

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.2.2, page 95, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.1.2.2 Football and Basketball. *In Divisions II and III, a* An institution's football or basketball camp or clinic may be conducted

only during the institution's summer vacation period unless such activities meet the provisions regarding developmental clinics set forth in 13.11.3.1."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To limit the conduct of a Division I member institution's football or basketball camp or clinic to the institution's summer vacation period unless such activities meet the provisions regarding developmental clinics set forth in 13.11.3.1, consistent with the current rule applicable to Divisions II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 129—1.

NO. 129—1 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS— PERMISSIBLE TIME PERIOD

Amend Proposal No. 129, 13.12.1 2.2, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.1.2.2 Football and Basketball. An institution's football or basketball camp or clinic may be conducted only during the *institution's summer vacation period* **months of June, July and August**, unless such activities meet the provisions regarding developmental clinics set forth in 13.11.3.1."

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and three other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 130 SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—PURPOSE

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.1 1, page 95, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.1.1.1 Purpose of Camp or Clinic. In Division I, an institution's sports camp or clinic shall involve activities designed to improve overall skills and general knowledge in the sport."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.2.1, page 95, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.12.1.2.1 Purposes Types of Camps or Clinics. In Divisions II and III, **a**An institution's sports camp or clinic shall be one that:

"(a) Places special emphasis on a particular sport or sports and provides specialized instruction, practice or competition;

"(b) **Involves activities designed to improve overall skills and general knowledge in the sport, or**

"(b)(c) Offers a diversified experience without emphasis on instruction, practice or competition in any particular sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To make consistent for all membership divisions the provisions identifying the purpose of an institution's sports camp or clinic.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: Approved by Division I; determined that voting line in Convention publications should not have included Divisions II and III, which already have these provisions in their rules. The order was changed to vote on Nos. 128 and 130 before No. 125.

NO. 131 RESOLUTION: FORMAL INVITATIONS— CERTIFIED POSTSEASON FOOTBALL GAMES

[Division I-A football only]

"Whereas, Bylaw 18.7.4 restricts the formal negotiations that may occur between a representative or an agent of a certified postseason football game and a representative of a member institution; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Special Events Committee has concluded that the restrictions specified in Bylaw 18.7.4 are ineffective, based upon past experience and current practices;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be directed to review and consider as a legislative amendment at the 1991 NCAA Convention a proposal that would either strengthen or eliminate the current limitations on the issuance of a formal invitation to participate in a bowl game by the representative or agent of a certified postseason football game and the formal acceptance of the invitation by a member institution's representative."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee)

Action: Approved by Division I-A.

NO. 132 INTERPRETATION: FINANCIAL AID

[All divisions, common vote]

In accordance with the provisions of NCAA Constitution 5.4.1.4, a member institution has requested a review of a Council interpretation. The interpretation was approved by the Council as follows.

"**Calculation of off-campus room and board stipend.** The NCAA Council has reviewed the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 15.2.2.1, and agreed that a member institution must use its on-campus room and board rate for determining the amount of similar expenses to be provided student-athletes who live off campus, unless the institution has no on-campus room and board facilities (per Bylaw 15.2.2.1.1)."

Source: University of Oregon.

Action: Council interpretation affirmed.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

The following chart reflects the votes of each active member institution and each voting conference on the proposals designated by the Presidents Commission for roll-call voting. Because of the large number of roll-call votes taken, the

YOUTH MEMBER	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	400	900	910	907	903	904	905	906	907
Abilene Christian University													Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Adelphi University													Yes	Yes				No	Yes	No
Adrian College																				
University of Akron	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No			Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Alabama A&M University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Alabama State University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
University of Alabama	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
University of Alabama-Birmingham	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
University of Alabama-Huntsville													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
University of Alaska-Anchorage													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
University of Alaska-Fairbanks													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Albany State College (Ga.)													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Albany State University (N.Y.)																				
Albion College																				
Albright College																				
Alcorn State University		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Alfred University																				
Allegheny College																				
Allegheny College																				
Alpena College																				
Alma College																				
American College of Puerto Rico													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
American International College													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
American South Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
American University																				
Amherst College																				
Angelo State University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Ansa Maria College	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Appalachian State University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Arizona State University	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
University of Arizona																				
Arkansas State University		Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
University of Arkansas-Little Rock	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Armstrong State College													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Asbury College																				
Ashtand University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Association of Mid-Century University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Association College													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Atlantic 10 Conference	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Atlantic Coast Conference																				
Auburn University	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Augsburg College																				
Augsburg College		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Austintown College (Ill.)													Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Augustana College (S.D.)													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Aurora University																				
Austin Peay State University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Avondale College																				
Babson College																				
Ball State University	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Baptist College																				
Baptist College	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Baylor University	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Belarmine College													Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Belmont College																				
Bendy State University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Bentley College													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Berea College																				
Bernard M. Baruch College																				
Bethany College (W. Va.)																				
Bethany College (W. Va.)																				
Bethune-Cookman College	Ill	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Big East Conference		No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Big Eight Conference	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Big Sky Conference	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Big South Conference	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Big Ten Conference	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Big West Conference	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Birmingham State University																				
Blackburn College																				
Bloomburg University													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Boise State University	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Bozeman College																				
Boston University		No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Bowdoin College																				
Bowling Green State University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Brainerd University		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
University of Bridgeport													Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Brigham Young University																				
Brigham Young University	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

following summary lists only the ballot numbers used in each vote. Use the key on pages A-138 and A-139 to identify the votes.

[illegible]

A-122

David Webster

A-124

Roll-Call Voting

A-126 _____ 1990 Convention Proceedings _____ Roll-Call Voting _____ A-127

A-128 _____ 1990 Convention Proceedings _____ Roll-Call Voting _____ A-129 _____

VOTING MEMBERS

	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville																																						
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale																																						
University of Southern Indiana																																						
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference																																						
University of Southern Maine																																						
Southern Methodist University																																						
University of Southern Mississippi																																						
Southern University																																						
Southern Utah State College																																						
Southern Wesleyan University																																						
Southwest Athletic Conference																																						
Southwest Baptist University																																						
Southwest Missouri State University																																						
Southwest Texas State University																																						
Southwestern Athletic Conference																																						
University of Southwestern Louisiana																																						
St. Lawrence College																																						
St. Augustine's College																																						
St. Bonaventure University																																						
College of Saint Catherine																																						
St. Louis University																																						
College of Saint Elizabeth																																						
St. Francis College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Francis College (Ill.)																																						
St. Ignace College																																						
St. Joseph's University (Pa.)																																						
St. Lawrence University																																						
St. Leo College																																						
St. Louis University																																						
St. Mary's College (Md.)																																						
St. Mary's College (Ill.)																																						
St. Mary's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Michael's College																																						
St. Norbert College																																						
St. Paul College																																						
St. Peter's College																																						
College of Saint Scholastica																																						
State University of New York																																						
State University of New York-Albany																																						
College of Saint Joseph																																						
St. John's University																																						
St. Joseph's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Joseph's College (Ill.)																																						
St. Mary's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Michael's College																																						
St. Norbert College																																						
St. Paul College																																						
St. Peter's College																																						
College of Saint Scholastica																																						
State University of New York																																						
State University of New York-Albany																																						
College of Saint Joseph																																						
St. John's University																																						
St. Joseph's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Joseph's College (Ill.)																																						
St. Mary's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Michael's College																																						
St. Norbert College																																						
St. Paul College																																						
St. Peter's College																																						
College of Saint Scholastica																																						
State University of New York																																						
State University of New York-Albany																																						
College of Saint Joseph																																						
St. John's University																																						
St. Joseph's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Joseph's College (Ill.)																																						
St. Mary's College (N.Y.)																																						
St. Michael's College																																						
St. Norbert College																																						
St. Paul College																																						
St. Peter's College																																						

[illegible]

	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	400	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907
Totals—Y	028	107	157	142	192	196	250	092	243	302	125	153	464	124	436	497	031	498	082	363
N	000	208	182	179	133	136	096	229	073	000	199	011	015	379	013	008	474	010	056	363
A	000	001	000	000	000	001	001	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	001	000	000	000	000
Ng1		2	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	1		6	3	2	1	1	1	1	7	3
Ng2																				

Legend: Y - Yes, N - No, A - Abstentions, Ng1 - Illegal (wrong proposal number), Ng2 - Illegal (no vote punched)

Key

Ballot No. 300—(Vote on) Proposal No. 34. **Ballot No. 301**—Proposal No. 26-1 (Amendment to Proposal No. 26-B to eliminate reference to recruitment, instead specifying that the individual would become a counter if he or she received a paid visit from the institution or was visited at his or her home by a coaching staff member). **Ballot No. 302**—Proposal No. 26-3 (Amendment to Proposal No. 26 to specify that student-athlete becomes a counter only when he or she participates in practice or represents the institution against outside competition). **Ballot No. 303**—Motion to reconsider No. 26-1. **Ballot No. 304**—Motion to reconsider No. 26-3. **Ballot No. 305**—Second vote on No. 26-3. **Ballot No. 306**—Proposal No. 26, as amended. **Ballot No. 307**—Proposal No. 27. **Ballot No. 308**—Proposal No. 37. **Ballot No. 309**—Proposal No. 69-B.

Ballot No. 310—Proposal No. 38. **Ballot No. 400**—Proposal No. 29. **Ballot No. 900**—Proposal No. 24-3 (Amendment to Proposal No. 24-D to specify that the individual student-athlete data would reflect averages for entering recruited student-athletes in each instance). **Ballot No. 901**—Proposal No. 24-4 (Amendment to Proposal No. 24-D to eliminate reporting by race). **Ballot No. 902**—Proposal No. 24-A. **Ballot No. 903**—Proposal Nos. 24-B and 24-C. **Ballot No. 904**—Motion to refer Proposal No. 24-D, as amended. **Ballot No. 905**—Proposal No. 24-D, as amended. **Ballot No. 906**—Proposal No. 31.

Ballot No. 907—Proposal No. 30-1 (Amendment to Proposal No. 30-A to include football and basketball in the resolution). **Ballot No. 908**—Proposal No. 30-A. **Ballot No. 909**—Motion to refer Proposal No. 30-A. **Ballot No. 910**—Motion to refer Proposal No. 30-G for Divisions II and III. **Ballot No. 911**—Proposal No. 30, as amended. **Ballot No. 912**—Motion to reconsider

908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937
710	120	154	266	082	112	213	133	014	108	195	156	147	153	223	152	206	107	206	256	011	040	130	201	501	464	405	059	636	569
003	150	250	148	156	055	025	061	193	012	156	016	177	080	087	168	118	024	063	219	075	886	438	165	220	084	025	020	111	
001	001	003	000	000	000	004	004	021	001	001	030	001	000	004	000	000	000	000	000	000	001	003	009	010	009	003	007	003	010
1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	3	5	1	4	1	2	2	2	1	5	2	1	4

Divisions II and III referral of Proposal No. 30-G. **Ballot No. 913**—Proposal No. 30-G, as amended. **Ballot No. 914**—Proposal 30-G, Division III. **Ballot No. 915**—Proposal No. 30-4 (Divisions I-A and I-AA) (Amendment to Proposal No. 30-B to permit 15 practice sessions, 10 involving contact, in a 21-day period). **Ballot No. 916**—Motion to refer Proposal No. 30-B, as amended. **Ballot No. 917**—Proposal No. 30-B, as amended.

Ballot No. 918—Motion to reconsider Division I referral of Proposal No. 30-G. **Ballot No. 919**—Proposal No. 30-6 (Amendment to Proposal No. 30-D to change October 15 to October 1). **Ballot No. 920**—Second motion to refer Proposal No. 30-G in Division I. **Ballot No. 921**—Proposal No. 30-D, as amended. **Ballot No. 922**—Proposal No. 30-11 (Division I) (Amendment to Proposal No. 30-G to permit an institution to use just one of the current basketball exemptions in any four-year period). **Ballot No. 923**—Proposal No. 30-7 (Amendment to Proposal No. 30-G to reinstate the 28-game limit). **Ballot No. 924**—Proposal No. 30-G, as amended (Division I). **Ballot No. 925**—Motion to refer Proposal Nos. 30-C and 30-E. **Ballot No. 926**—Proposal No. 30-C (Division III). **Ballot No. 927**—Proposal Nos. 30-C and 30-E.

Ballot No. 928—Proposal No. 30-F (Division III). **Ballot No. 929**—Motion to reconsider Proposal No. 31. **Ballot No. 930**—Motion to reconsider Proposal No. 30. **Ballot No. 931**—Proposal No. 33-A. **Ballot No. 932**—Proposal No. 32-1 (Amendment to Proposal No. 32-A to clarify prohibition against any organized athletics activities but to eliminate reference to use of weight-training facilities). **Ballot No. 933**—Proposal No. 32-A, as amended. **Ballot No. 934**—Proposal No. 32-B. **Ballot No. 935**—Proposal No. 52. **Ballot No. 936**—Proposal No. 54. **Ballot No. 937**—Proposal No. 53.

Appendix C

84th Annual Convention

Nominating Committee

Chair—Karen L. Miller

- I-1—Susan A. Collins, George Mason University
- I-1—Kevin M. White, University of Maine
- I-2—Richard L. Sander, Virginia Commonwealth University
- I-2—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
- I-3—Daniel G. Gibbens, University of Oklahoma
- I-3—Bradford E. Kinsman, University of Detroit
- I-4—Margie H. McDonald, High Country Athletic Conference
- I-4—Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University
- II-1—Francis W. Poisson, University of Bridgeport
- II-2—Wilburn A. Campbell Jr., Albany State College (Georgia)
- II-3—Dean Davenport, Ferris State University
- II-4—Karen L. Miller, California State Poly. U., Pomona
- III-1—Lawrence R. Schiner, Jersey City State College
- III-2—Geraldine Knortz, Hamilton College
- III-3—Louis F. Miller, Hampden-Sydney College
- III-4—John M. Schael, Washington University (Missouri)

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—William D. McHenry

- District 1—McKinley Boston Jr., University of Rhode Island
- District 2—G. Larry James, Stockton State College
- District 3—Dave Hart, Southern Conference
- District 4—Bruce A. Corrie, Northwestern University
- District 5—Ken B. Jones, Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Assn.
- District 6—Donald C. Landry, Southland Conference
- District 7—Stanley B. Sheriff, University of Hawaii
- District 8—Dan Guerrero, California State U., Dominguez Hills
- At Large—Gene E. Hooks, Wake Forest University
- At Large—David M. Hutter, Case Western Reserve U.
- At Large—William D. McHenry, Washington and Lee University
- At Large—John M. Williams, Mississippi College

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Elizabeth Murphey

- District 1—Linda S. Moulton, Clark University (Massachusetts)
- District 2—Susan W. Lubking, West Chester Univ. of Pennsylvania
- District 3—Bettye Giles, University of Tennessee, Martin
- District 4—Marnie W. Swift, University of Toledo
- District 5—Barbara Hibner, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
- District 6—Barbara Camp, Southern Methodist University
- District 7—Fern Gardner, University of Utah
- District 8—Marcia Saneholtz, Washington State University
- At Large—Harriett Crannell, Millikin University
- At Large—Peggy Martin, Central Missouri State University

At Large—Elizabeth Murphey, University of Georgia
At Large—Lynn M. Pacala, Occidental College

Voting Committee

Chair—Marnie W. Swift

- District 1—Richard J. Hazelton, Trinity College (Connecticut)
- District 2—Joseph Barresi, College of Staten Island
- District 3—Eric Hyman, Virginia Military Institute
- District 4—Marnie W. Swift, University of Toledo
- District 5—Lynn Dorn, North Dakota State University
- District 6—Gerard L. St. Martin, U. of Southwestern Louisiana
- District 7—Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana
- District 8—Bradley L. Rothermel, Univ. of Nevada, Las Vegas
- At Large—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
- At Large—Norman D. Kaye, St. Leo College
- At Large—John C. Martin, Delaware State College
- At Large—Daniel P. Starr, Canisius College
- At Large—Patricia W. Wall, Southeastern Conference

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Joanne A. Fortunato

- James Doyle, DePaul University
- Joanne A. Fortunato, Keene State College
- Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College

Credentials Committee

Chair—Diane Fairchild

- Paul H. Brand, Univ. of Alabama, Huntsville
- Diane Fairchild, Grinnell College
- Johnny Hardwick, Alabama State University

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1991 Convention

Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee, January 8-11

Appendix D

Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1989

Years Name, Institution

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
 (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University,
 University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989— —Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908— —William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
 (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
 (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University

1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
 1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
 District of Columbia
 1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
 1989— —Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985— —Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986— —Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1989— —B. J. Skelton, Clemson University

Division II Vice-President

1983— —Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986— —Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
 1989— —Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University

Division III Vice-President

1983— —Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster
 1990— —Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC
1NCAA00002143N

NCAA